Morton, H.A.

378.744
BO
AM1932
no.2

Boston University
College of Liberal Arts
Library

THE GIFT OF the Author

378.744
BO
AM1932

48526 mor

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

THE SCHOLARSHIP OF JESUS

by

Henry Alston Morton

(A.B., Oklahoma City University, 1930)

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

1932

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

48526

378.744
BO
A.M.1932
mor

OUTLINE

INTRODUCTION. 1

A. The Aim of the Paper 6

B. The Scope of the Paper 7

The Synoptic Gospels

The Gospel of John

An Evaluation of Sources

Secondary Sources

The New Testament Apocrypha

Oxyrhynchus Documents

Josephus and Tacitus

I THE TRAINING OF JESUS 19

A. The Training of Jesus as a Boy 21

1. Jesus' Home Life

2. Training in School

3. The Influence of the Synagogue

4. The Training of Fellowship

5. The Training of the Out-of-Doors

B. Jesus and Language 34

C. Jesus and His Source Material. 38

The Old Testament Canon

The Old Testament Apocrypha

The Talmud

II JESUS' USE OF HIS KNOWLEDGE IN DIRECT QUOTATION OR IN REFERENCES 46

A. Jesus' Quotations from the Old Testament . 47

B. Jesus' Use of Apocalyptic Literature . . . 58

C. Other Documents Used 59

III THE BROADER ASPECTS OF JESUS' SCHOLARSHIP . . . 63

A. Jesus as a Critical Scholar. 64

1. Criticism of Jewish Legalism

2. Attitude Toward the State and Messianic Consciousness

3. Interpretation of Religious Values

4. The World Vision of Jesus

B. Jesus as a Sympathetic Scholar 87

1. His Appreciation of Nature

2. His Dealings with People

IV SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION. 93

Conclusion 95

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 99

INTRODUCTION

Over the desk of a preacher there hangs a small wall motto which reads:

"A pupil sttends classes;
A student studies;
A scholar masters."

In this age of many books and of great opportunity, when the world is more and more seeking to raise the standard of literacy and to lower the percentage of illiteracy, most children, at least in the western world, know the meaning of the word "pupil." There are more students emerging from the schools of the land. And it must be recognized that a student may study and learn even though he may never see a schoolroom. Any community has its loved seer who has never been privileged to sit at the feet of a master, but who has, nevertheless, learned much in the schools of the world. There are those who study nature and become wise in her secrets. Some of them are uncouth and rough in appearance but have a magical touch and a calm assurance of power when they come into the presence of their own elements. They are woodsmen. They are the pioneers who lead the way for the growth of civilization into new fields. There are those who have studied and learned the ways of the sea and who feel at home in the presence of the storms on the waters, when the unlearned

stand in fear. They can read the "signs" of the heavens, and they know the ways of the deep. There are those who are limited in resources although their minds range widely. They do not all become discouraged. Some study the little things close at hand, and learn that a new world, whose existence was never dreamed is present at their very doors. Such was Jean Henri Fabre who studied the insects of France and made Avignon famous as the home of the man who knew more about the little things of everyday life than anyone in the world. He learned and taught the world that in "The Life of the Fly" there is much more than we suspect. He is the student who made the common things great. And there are those who study humanity. Not the chemistry of the body or the anatomy of mankind, not the physiology or psychology of human behavior, not philosophy or the way in which we think, but the needs of the human soul either in joy or in sorrow. These are the beloved "grandmas," "aunties," and "uncles" of any rural community.

Such lives are truly great, but they are limited by circumstance. Beyond them, there is still another class. The age of the pioneer has past. They study all that has gone before and then go forth to use the knowledge which they gain from all sources, at the same time enriching it by what they learn and see on every hand. A scholar masters, but

a complete mastery is never to be found. If man should ever reach the end of knowledge, life would be a drab existence indeed. The scholar masters what is at hand, and with the increased power which that mastery gives, he goes forth to face the greater problems of the world which are not yet within the scope of his ability.

Webster defines a scholar as "a learned person; one versed in any branch, or in many branches, of knowledge; a person of thorough literary or scientific attainments."

"A century ago James Trecothick Austin, a Boston lawyer of eminence, delivered the Phi Beta Kappa oration at Harvard, taking as his subject 'The Duties of Men of Education.' He found the value of education to be 'in the ability to discover, to propound, and to ascertain truth, and that this can be best carried on only by scholars in the language and thought of the past and in the academic isolation of the university.' The use of their knowledge for the advancement of the great interests of mankind was the duty of educated men, however.

"Fifty years later, Wendell Phillips, who had heard the Austin oration and had taken his own Harvard degree the following day, delivered the Phi Beta Kappa address. His subject was 'The Scholar in a Republic.' It was a 'scathing indictment of the scholar who lived a life apart, divorced from the real interests of the country, interested only in

learning in the cloister and not in the affairs of real life.'

"Prof. Joseph H. Beale of the Harvard law school heard Phillips speak. 'We can see him still,' says Mr. Beale, 'with head thrown back, and with his brilliant eyes flashing.' Last June it fell to him to deliver the oration, now printed in full in the Harvard Graduates' Magazine. He chose as his theme 'The World and the Scholar,' devoting himself, with variations, to the same subject which had occupied his predecessors a century and a half-century before.

"Austin 'saw scholars as a favored few, a separate class, training their minds to reason and applying that reason to what he called the liberalization of religion.' In his day only the classics were 'adequately presented' in the university. Everything was divorced from life, either because of its subject-matter, or by its method of presentation. But Phillips would have no such cloistered scholarship. The training of the mind for him was to promote not personal happiness but the public good. Scholarship then was tending distinctly toward contacts with the actual conditions of life.

"What of the scholar in this present age of mechanization? Says Prof. Beale: 'Humanity has been greatly liberated from labor; but it has been liberated not for inglorious ease but for study and thought.' The farmer, the small grocer, everybody who would prosper today, must think. The scholars who might have listened to Phillips's oration

are 'not only the statesmen of this century. They are the engineers, the bridge builders, the inventors of the sky-scraper and the Leviathan; they are the financiers, the creators of the great corporations, the almi patres of agriculture and of industry; they are the chemists and the physicists, the inventors of the telephone and the phonograph and the electric light, of the moving picture and the radio, the discoverers of the applications of chemistry to life and death; they are the biologists and the physiologists, the surgeons who have lessened human pain and lengthened human life.' These 'have not been the accidental findings of un-educated men.'

"Scholarship does not abandon its old aims. But the scholar now must be 'oriented to the world, not only, but he must add to the training of 1831 and 1881 a thorough professional training in some one subject.'.....Now we have schools of agriculture, journalism, forestry, architecture. 'From torch to torch the fire has spread.' A great business school now is established on the Charles. The scholar now takes all life as his field."[1]

---

1. Editorial in The Boston Herald, Sept. 10, 1931.

A. THE AIM OF THIS PAPER

It will be the aim of this paper to show that Jesus of Nazareth was a true scholar. We shall deal not so much with the academic definition from Webster but with the broader definition which has been outlined. It will be maintained that Jesus knew much of the lore and history of his own people. He had mastered the Scripture of the Jews.[1] He had plumbed the depths of the heart of God and was sure of himself and of his relation to God. He was a genius in things of life and the relation of life to the Unseen Reality. He had mastered the meaning of religion.

There are those who are called scholars who know so much of a subject that they lose connection with the affairs of the world. Some men are so learned in a subject that they are veritable fools in every other aspect of life. A "doctor" has facetiously been called "one who knows more and more about less and less." With this kind of scholarship we are not interested. In a better sense we would like to call Jesus "A Doctor of the Kingdom of God." The thesis of this paper is, then, that Jesus was a true scholar, who was well well versed in matters of religion and of the relation of religion to the lives of men, that he discriminated in his source materials, that he interpreted and used the material

1. This is not to intimate that Jesus was versed in Rabbinic lore or was considered by his contemporaries to be an authority in the traditions of the law. But He knew what was expected of men. He had mastered that subject.

which he had mastered (be it oral or written tradition or simple lives) and gave to the world a new evaluation of men in their relationship to God.

In presenting this thesis, we shall first consider the source material which is available to the present day student in the search for knowledge of Jesus. Then the training of Jesus so far as it was influenced by schools or by other means of teaching will be considered. The written documents which may have been available to him will be listed. In the second section of the paper, the purer aspects of scholarship will be treated. Since we have nothing from the pen of Jesus himself we must rely on those who write of him. But this is a source not to be despised. Then, in the third section, the broader aspect of scholarship as seen in the life of this man will be presented.

B. THE SCOPE OF THE PAPER.

The canonical gospels are the great source for our knowledge of Jesus. Most of what we know of his life, either his work or teachings, is presented in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. They give a picture which is fragmentary, but which can be pieced together. They do not agree, but that very fact is proof of their worth rather than otherwise, for a close agreement would point toward collaboration. It is generally agreed that the Gospel of Mark is our oldest

record of the life of Jesus. It was used by the authors of both Matthew and Luke in the preparation of these Gospels, but it was also supplemented by each. The three Gospels come to us from the latter half of the first century so they are records originating not long after the death of Jesus. Because of the close harmony among these three they are called the Synoptic Gospels. They make no attempt to give a complete record of the life of Jesus but we may believe that they record the outstanding events in his life. The deeds and sayings which were so impressed on his followers as to be remembered are those which have found place in the Gospels. So the fragments are undoubtedly the high points in Jesus' life. The general picture which they give of the man is true. We find the life of Jesus to be consistent throughout. How valuable they are may be shown by the fact that a difficult passage can best be interpreted in the light of the whole. Compare the questioned words with the complete character as presented by the total experience found in the Gospels, and their true meaning can be found.

The Gospel of John gives a different picture. It was written much later than the synoptics. The material found here is almost entirely different from that presented in the synoptic gospels. It has a philosophical touch which is at variance with the picture of the plain man who spoke to common people. While the synoptic Gospels treat of miracles

in several instances, John presents material which sounds improbable or impossible. There are Biblical scholars, however, who hold firmly to the historical accuracy of John. Hayes says, "No writer in the New Testament is more devoted to the historical truth than is John. . . .Throughout his narrative there is all the guilelessness of perfect sincerity, all the simplicity of utter truthfulness. On every page there is a touch of reality."[1] That he is not alone in this opinion is evidenced when he maintains that such scholars as Askwith, Bleek, Brooke, Wendt, and Robinson "are ready to sign their names to the attestation at the close of the book, 'This is the disciple that beareth witness of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his witness is true.'"[2] On the other hand, Schmiedel,[3] Drummond,[4] Jackson,[5] Gilbert,[6] and Bacon are in opposition to this trustworthiness. Some of their reasons are based on textual criticisms and evident historical errors, which are outside the scope of this paper, but they are in agreement with the idea that "The Fourth Gospel aims not so much to recall as to interpret. Its author aims not so much to tell what Jesus <u>did</u> say as what he would have said under conditions as they were at the close of the first century."[7]

In the light of modern scholarship this last view seems

1. Hayes, <u>John and His Writings</u>, p. 101.
2. Ibid., p. 102.
3. Schmiedel, <u>The Johannine Writings</u>, pp. 138,139.
4. Drummond, <u>The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel</u>, p. 65.
5. Jackson, <u>The Problem of the Fourth Gospel</u>, p. 51.
6. Gilbert, <u>Jesus and His Bible.</u>
7. Bacon, <u>Jesus, the Son of Man</u>, p. 14.

the more reasonable. If it were necessary, the Fourth Gospel might be used to give further proof of the scholarship of Jesus. However, it would only add additional materials of the same kind as we find in the Synoptics. Even though the author of John puts words into the mouth of Jesus, still the tradition must have been strong that Jesus quoted much from the Jewish Scriptures else John would not have been successful in his work. While "in the last gospel, there are no quotations by Jesus from the Old Testament and no remarks concerning it by him which can be regarded otherwise than as integral parts of the author's own composition,"[1] still these quotations and references are such as the author felt Jesus would have made. There is just one detail which should be noted in the general picture which is given in the Fourth Gospel as differing from that given of Jesus by the Synoptists. "In the Fourth Gospel, the references by Jesus to the Messianic element in Scripture are much more numerous (than in the Synoptic Gospels) still, they are open rather than allusive."[2]

It is evident that the sources of these gospels must be evaluated before their material can be accepted. While there is not a general agreement as to the date and source of the Gospel of John, there is so much question on the matter that it will be practically ignored in this paper. Coming late in the first century it is so tinged with Hellenistic thought,

1. Gilbert, op. cit., p. 125.
2. Ibid., p. 125.

that it is very difficult to determine accurately how much it actually represents of the historic Jesus. And, as has been said, it offers nothing unique and distinct as to the scholarship of Jesus.

Luke, certainly, and the author of the Gospel of Matthew, probably, had no personal knowledge of Jesus. Mark may have seen him a few times but was not with him as one of the disciples. So the Synoptic Gospels have as their authors men who received their information second hand. There is every reason to believe, however, that they had accurate and true information. The tradition was strong at the time of the writing of these gospels. Their content must have been checked by the oral tradition and by the various documents in the hands of the churches. Their general self-consistency and the few occasional minor errors both favor their historical value. Coming as they do years after the crucifixion, the thought will arise that it was impossible to remember the words of Jesus. That is true. Several scholars have intimated that the only actual quotations we have from Jesus are the Aramaic utterances which have been preserved - just a few words. Literally, this may be the case, but it does not represent the value of the gospels as portrayals of the life of Jesus or further as indicative of his use of the Jewish Scripture. The authors of the sources of the Synoptic Gospels remembered that Jesus had many times quoted from the Law and

the Prophets. They remembered, in many instances, the very passages which he had quoted. This is not at all remarkable for these passages were associated with the outstanding lessons which he taught, and which were incorporated in our Gospels. The unique character of the things he said is partly responsible for this. His were not usual words, which were easily forgotten. Rather the content of his message was new and this stamped it indelibly on the minds of those who heard. I make no effort to maintain that Jesus' words have been quoted verbally. I do hold that the Gospels bring us his essential thought, and that, in particular, the quoted passages are correct.

One further point needs to be made clear. There has been much criticism on the authenticity of certain of the quotations attributed to Jesus because they correspond to the Hebrew or even to the Septuagint version of the Scriptures instead of to the Aramaic, which, it is generally thought, was the common language of Palestine in his day.[1] I have said that those who gave the tradition in written form were concerned with the thought and the general accuracy of the passage. They were not interested in verbal accuracy. So they used the version of the Old Testament which was in vogue at the time they wrote and in the place where their documents were to be read, rather than going back to search for the minute difference in verbal translation which came as Hebrew was rendered into Aramaic or into Greek.

For this reason the words of Jesus as given in the

1. See also Chapter I, B of this paper.

Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are accepted as authentic except in those instances where other considerations point definitely to their inaccuracy. Thus the Synoptic Gospels form the primary source for the knowledge of Jesus.

There are other secondary sources which must also be considered. The first of these is the New Testament Apocrypha. Harnack and Zahn have published the best accounts and collections of this Apocrypha. The books which contain sayings of Jesus, as distinct from records of his works, are:

The Gospel of the Egyptians
The Gospel according to the Hebrews
The Gospel of the Ebionites
The Gospel of Matthias
The Gospel of Philip
The Gospel of Thomas
The Fayoom Gospel-Fragment
The Gospel of Eve
The Gospel of John at Paris
The Preaching of Peter
The History of Joseph
The Gospel of Nicodemus

The value of these apocryphal works is debatable. Certainly the early church did not consider them of sufficient value to be included in the canon. Some present such a record of the life of Jesus as is wholly incompatible with what we have from the canonical Gospels and hence they must be rejected. There is less trouble with the sayings of Jesus which are recorded than with the accounts of his deeds which tend to emphasize the miraculous.

The following are some of the most valuable of the sayings

of Jesus as found in the documents.

> "When thy brother has sinned against thee with a word, and has satisfied thee, thou shalt receive him again seven times in a day." Said to Him Peter His disciple: "seven times in a day?" The Lord answered and said to him: "but I say unto thee also seventy times seven times. For in the prophets also the word sin is found, after they were anointed with the Holy Spirit." From the Gospel according to the Hebrews.[1]

Likewise from the Gospel according to the Hebrews is the following account.

> "Another rich man said to Him: 'Master what good thing shall I do to live?' He said to him: 'O man, fulfill the laws and the prophets.' He replied: 'I have fulfilled.' He said to him:'Go,sell that thou possesseth, and distribute to the poor, and come follow Me.' But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it did not please him. And the Lord said to him: 'How sayest thou, I have fulfilled the law and the prophets, since it is written in the law: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" and lo! many of thy brethren, sons of Abraham, are clothed in filth, dying of hunger, and thy house is full of many goods, and nothing at all goes out of it to them.'. . . ."[2]

> "Suffer it, for thus it is becoming that all things be fulfilled." - From the Gospel of the Ebionites.[3]

These apocryphal documents are very valuable in the study of the canon but it is evident from the above selections that the gist of what Jesus is reported to have said has been included in the canonical Gospels. So while these gospels must be recognized, they give nothing new to the study of the scholarship of Jesus.

There are other scattered sayings of Jesus, but they are of minor importance. The reference in Acts xx: 35 may well

1. Pick, The Extra-Canonical Life of Christ, p. 270,f.
2. Ibid., p. 271.
3. Ibid., p. 474.

be from the synoptic gospels and so will not interest us. Likewise the references in the Didache are too late to be valuable for they, too, may have their source either in the canonical gospels or in the source material of these gospels. The same holds true of such mention of the words of Jesus as are given by the Church Fathers. Codex D offers a few variations from the text which we follow but this is rather a matter for textual criticism and any possible changes will not affect the worth or truth of Jesus' scholarship.

The most interesting of the non-canonical sources for the life of Jesus is the so-called Oxyrhynchus document. This was uncovered in Egypt by Grenfell and Hunt in 1897. There are seven paragraphs purporting to be sayings of Jesus.

> 1. (Jesus saith, Cast out first the beam from thine own eye), and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye.
> 2. Jesus saith, except ye fast to the world, ye shall in no wise find the kingdom of God; and except ye keep the sabbath, ye shall not see the Father.
> 3. Jesus saith, I stood in the midst of the world, and in the flesh was I seen of them, and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst among them, and my soul grieveth over the sons of men, because they are blind in their heart (and see not), poor, and know not their poverty.
> 4. Jesus saith, Wherever they are two they are not without God, and if one is found anywhere, I say I am with him. Raise the stone, there thou shalt find me; cleave the wood, and there I am.
> 5. Jesus saith, A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither doth a physician work cures upon them that know him.

6. Jesus saith, A city built on the top of a high hill and firmly established can neither fall nor be hid.
7. (Jesus saith,) Thou hearest with one ear, but the other thou hast closed.[1]

Of these, Nos. 1, 5, and the first part of 6 are comparable to passages in the Synoptic Gospels. The others have occasioned much discussion. The second is of most interest so far as this paper is concerned. It contradicts the thought of Jesus as recorded in our canon. It is not in keeping with the man who spoke in the Sermon on the Mount, "It was said to you of old, but I say . . . " Of course, if the context were known, the passage might be more clear. But because of its contradiction of the better authenticated work, it must be left as worthy of small consideration in the study of the scholarship of Jesus.

A second fragment was found in the same place in 1904. One section of this fragment is "quoted twice by Clement of Alexandria, once as from the Gospel according to the Hebrews."[2] Most of the material found in this fragment is evidently based on passages from our canonical gospels. One passage, however, is worthy of particular note:

> Jesus saith: Ask now the cattle, and they that draw you shall say to you, "The Kingdom is in Heaven." Ask the fowls of the heaven, and they will say that it is under the earth. Go down into the deep and the fishes of the sea will tell you it is not there. Verily the Kingdom of Heaven is within you, and whosoever knoweth himself shall find it.[3]

---

1. There is considerable difference among scholars in the restoration of these sayings. These have been quoted from Barton, Archaeology and The Bible, pp.428,f. Peters, in Bible and Spade, p. 227, gives an eighth excerpt which consists of the lone word: ". . .poverty."
2. Peters, Bible and Spade, p. 228, footnote.
3. Ibid., p. 228, footnote.

This passage has been "restored by comparison with Job 11:7-9, 12:7-9; Ezra 38:20."[1] If, then, it is authentic, it adds this further bit of evidence that Jesus knew and used much of the Hebrew Scripture as will be shown later.

There remains but one other source to consider. What do the secular writings of the time say of Jesus? Many documents and fragments have been found which purport to deal with the life of Jesus but these have almost entirely been rejected by modern scholarship as worthless. The Jewish historian, Josephus, however, has a passage which is very interesting and which does not carry the same type of propaganda which marks these others writings as spurious.

> Now about this time appeared Jesus, a wise man, if indeed one may call Him a man; for He was a doer of marvelous works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with gladness, and He drew to himself many of the Jews, as also many of the Greeks. He was the Christ; and when, on the indictment of the leading men amongst us, Pilate had sentenced Him to the cross, those who loved Him at the first did not cease to do so; for on the third day He again appeared to them alive, as the divine prophets had affirmed these and innumberable other things concerning Him. And the race of Christians, which takes its name from Him, is not yet extinct.[2]

Concerning this passage Von Dobschutz says: "Modern criticism has thrown serious doubts upon the authenticity of the passage, but not without good reason. For not only does Origen seem to be unacquainted with it . . . but it simply could not have come from a man like Josephus."[3]

1. Ibid., p. 228, footnote.
2. Antiquities xviii, iii 3, IN Josephus Flavius, ANTIQUITIES OF THE JEWS, Vol II, p. 70.
3. Hastings, Encyclopaedia of Christ and the Gospels, Vol. I, Article, "Josephus," p. 652.

However, there is one mention of Jesus made by a secular writer which is authentic. It is by the Roman historian Tacitus. "'The originator of that name,' - Tacitus is speaking of those whom the common people in Rome, as he says, called 'Christians' as a term of reproach-- 'The originator of that name, one Christus, had been executed in the reign of Tiberius by order of the Administrator, Pontius Pilate.' (Annals 15:44) The contemptuous sentence of the Roman historian is the only information about the life and career of Jesus of Nazareth that has come down to us independently of Christian tradition."[1]

It appears then that the basis for our knowledge of Jesus, his work, and his teachings, must rest back primarily on the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. John adds a different touch, but in a different atmosphere, and for the purpose of this paper the Fourth Gospel presents nothing not found in the Synoptics. The New Testament Apocrypha, the later writings concerning Jesus, the recently discovered fragments purporting to come from him, and the record of Josephus are either valueless, not authentic, or find their value in their likeness to the canonical accounts of the life of Jesus. The mention of Jesus by Tacitus is interesting but does nothing more than confirm the fact of his life and crucifixion, giving nothing of value to us here.

---

1. Burkitt, The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus, p.1.

CHAPTER I

These Gospels which have been discussed are concerned chiefly with the ministry of Jesus after the baptism when he "was about thirty years of age."[1] The record which we have of his life prior to that time is very meagre. As a child he "grew and waxed strong, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him."[2] At the age of twelve he was taken with his parents to Jerusalem to attend the feast of the Passover. This is the only real picture we have of his boyhood. Luke tells the story of his being lost and going into the Temple to wait for his parents. There he astonished the teachers at the the keen insight of a youth of his years.[3] Much more has often been read into this incident than is actually told. It is evident, however, that the boy had a good mind, and that he had been well trained. It is not necessary to think that a boy of twelve was confounding the teachers of the Temple with his wisdom. Perhaps their attention was first attracted to him by the fact that he was alone, while his appearance evidenced the fact that he was from Galilee. Did he assure them, when asked, that he had been left behind, but that he was certain that his parents would first look for him in the Temple? Did they seek to help him and to make the hours pass more pleasantly? Then, were they surprised at his ability to sit quietly and listen -

1. Luke 3:23.
2. Luke 2:40.
3. Luke 2:41-51.

truly an art? Did one of the elders care for the boy over night and talk with him, becoming amazed at his interest in the affairs of the Temple? This would lead to further opportunity for Jesus to question these men regarding many things of the Temple of Jehovah and the Law and the history of his people - questions which had been raised in his mind but which had not been answered in Nazareth so far from the seat of the religious center of the Jews. A reasonable interpretation such as this leads to the idea that the boy Jesus was a lad whose mind turned toward religious subjects. He was interested in all that had to do with the synagogue and Temple, with Jehovah and the dealings of God with His people.

Then, between this incident at the age of twelve and the beginning of his teaching at thirty, one verse only tells of his life. Eighteen years are covered with the words: "And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."[1]

Of late years there has been much speculation concerning these years of which the Gospels are silent. A great deal has been written. Much of it is fanciful, and many authors have allowed their zeal to make their writing almost absurd. Perhaps the best is Oxenham's "The Hidden Years." He has caught the spirit of the Christ and has carried it back into the life of a normal boy. The boy is made father to the man. And the life of the Jewish community of the time is portrayed. The

1. Luke 2:52.

best picture we can have then, of these hidden years of the life of Jesus is that which we may get from a survey of the time.

A. The Training of Jesus as a Boy

Jesus was probably trained as any normal Jewish boy of his age. The home was an important institution among the Jews and it played the first and a very important part in the training of the boy. From the home, he would go into the school. At the same time he was receiving instruction in the synagogue which was indeed of great importance in moulding his life. Then, as today, the comradeship of his fellows must have played an important part in the training of the boy. After he grew in years and play hours were shortened, while work in the carpenter shop became a serious business, still the association of men who came there would teach much. And the influence of the great out-of-doors must not be forgotten. How strong this influence was in the life of Jesus will be indicated later. It is not to be marveled at, for the same type of personality is to be seen today, and the value of this training is so evident that it is being stressed by many of the boys' organizations.

1. Jesus' home Life.

Parents are advised today to "bring up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart therefrom."[1]

1. Proverbs 22:6.

The Jew believed this and practiced it. Jewish home training was strict. Aside from the synagogue, the home was the center of life. Father and mother were honored, and severe was the penalty for a violation of this commandment. The father was responsible that the laws of Israel were transmitted to his children.

> For he established a testimony in Jacob,
> And appointed a law in Israel,
> Which he commanded our fathers,
> That they should make them known to their children;
> That the generation to come might know them, even
> the children which should be born;
> Who should arise and tell them to their children.[1]

This is stressed even more in the Deuteronomic Code:

> Thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children and shall talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.[2]

These admonitions were heeded. "'Our ground is good.' says Josephus, 'and we work it to the utmost; but our chief ambition is for the nurture of our children!' According to R. Salome, a father had as well bury his son as neglect his instruction."[3] From the side of the child, Josephus says that "from their earliest consciousness," they had "learned the laws, so as to have them, as it were, engraven upon the soul."[4]

This training began in earliest infancy. It did not wait even for the child to be able to talk. The parents were

1. Psalm 78:5,6. Cf., also Gen. 18:19).
2. Deut. 6:7. For further references regarding the training of children, see Ex. 12:26; 13:8,14; Deut. 4:9,10; 6:20; 11:19; 31:13).
3. Smith, Days of His Flesh, p. 20.
4. Edersheim, Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ, p. 111.

devout in their own lives and the child, long before he could understand, would see the father and others reverently touch the Mesusah and kiss the fingers, speaking at the same time a benediction. Later the child would enter into the private and united prayers of the family life. These would, of course, not be understood at once but there would be no memory of a time when they were not. The domestic rites would always have had their place in the life of the child. Some of these rites would mark important ceremonial occasions, and the memory of these times would persist before their significance could be understood. Such were the feast of dedication, when each house was illuminated. On the first night one candle was placed for each member of the family, two for each member on the second, and so on until on the eighth night there were eight candles for each member of the group. Then the Feast of Purim (on the 14th Adar) was marked by good cheer and merriment. Later came the Feast of Tabernacles when even the youngest member of the household quitted the home and lived out in a booth. Most important of all came the annual celebration of the Passover which would first be remembered by the change in the taste of the food.[1]

References have been made to the Jewish laws which required the father to explain the meaning of this most important of the Jewish feasts. "At a certain part of the service it

1. Ibid., p. 107,f.

was expressly ordained, that the youngest at the Paschal table should rise and formally ask what was the meaning of all this service, and how that night was distinguished from others; to which the father was to reply, by relating, in language suitable to the child's capacity, the whole national history of Israel, from the calling of Abraham down to the deliverance from Egypt and the giving of the law; 'and the more fully,' it is added, 'he explains it all, the better.'"[1]

The training of children in the Scripture was not far different from the training given today. The mother taught her child a verse of Scripture by repeating it over and over. As soon as this was learned another was taught, until the memorized passages became very great. This was generally begun at about three years of age. This careful training of the memory in early years is evidenced by the ability of the rabbis to remember such great numbers of oral laws and traditions. What has been ascribed to the Jews as a mental characteristic was really a matter of early training. Edersheim suggests that mnemonic rules and other devices were used to facilitate the memorizing of texts, benedictions, etc.

At five years of age the reading of the Hebrew Bible was begun. The question of the availability of the Scripture to the average family has been raised. However, a reference to the time of the Maccabees is evidence of the presence of the Scripture among the common people. "At the time of the Syrian

1. Ibid., p. 110.

persecutions, just before the rising of the Maccabees, the possession of portions or of the whole of the Old Testament by private familites was common in Israel. For part of those persecutions consisted in making search for these Scriptures and destroying them. (1 Macc.1:57)"[1]

How important the actual Scriptures were considered is very evident when Edersheim continues, "We know from the Talmud that . . . probably at the time of Christ there were little parchment rolls especially for the use of children, containing such portions of Scripture as the 'Shema' (Deut. 6:49; 11: 13-21; Num. 15:37-41), the Hallel (Ps. 113-118), the history of the Creation to that of the Flood, and the first eight chapters of the book of Leviticus."[2]

This training was progressive and the child soon began to attend school. Also in the Synagogue his training continued. At ten years of age, he would begin the reading of the Mishnah, then at thirteen he would be bound to the law, entailing a journey to the Temple at Jerusalem for this ceremony, and at fifteen years the study of the oral law was begun.

2. Training in School.

There is considerable disagreement as to schools in the time of Jesus. Edersheim says that at six years of age he would have been sent to school, and does not question their existence at all. Rather he feels that a school was attached

1. Ibid., p. 116, f.
2. Ibid., p. 117.

to every synagogue in the land. These schools were not at all comparable to the public school of today. First they were quite limited in size, that is, they did not pretend to care for the student except for a few years. The primary education was the responsibility of the home. After the child was bound to the law, his days at the school were limited. Of course, if he were preparing for the priesthood then he must continue his training. And this would probably require attendance at a school in Jerusalem or at least in some large center.

On the other hand, Berguer reports, "'Among the ancient Hebrews,' Stapfer tells us, 'the education of the child took place in the family. We can find no trace of public schools anywhere before the return from the exile. After the Restoration the scribes founded schools, but they were not intended for the children. . . It was not until the year 64 A.D. that public schools were established generally. Nevertheless it seems probable that in the time of Jesus there was a school at Nazareth, directed no doubt not by a master ad hoc, but simply by the Hazzan or factotum of the synagogue.'"[1]

Other authors will not be dogmatic either to assert or deny the existence of schools. Josephus says that as a general custom there were schools where the children learn "letters." And Case says that the boys learned reading and writing at the schools and that perhaps there was some instruction in connection with the synagogues.

1. Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus, p. 131.

3. The Influence of the Synagogue.

Whether the schools of the day were conducted in connection with the synagogue or not makes little difference. First, the instructors would probably be the scribes in any case for they were the learned men of the times. Then, secondly, the curriculum would best be taught by the scribe for the reading and writing were principally of the Hebrew Scripture. So that wherever the school was held the subject matter was all pertaining to the religious and devotional life of the people.

One author suggests that the synagogue performed an additional function, and that the Sunday School which has been considered to be of very recent development was to be found in Israel at the time of Jesus. "On the Sabbath day, the mothers also took their children to the Hazzan for a sort of Sunday School, which completed their elementary instruction. There is no reason to suppose that Jesus ever attended the schools of the scribes which gave one the right to the title of rabbi; perhaps nothing of the kind existed at Nazareth. But he knew enough to read the books of the Law."[1] The study of the character of the boy as portrayed by his later life leads Weiss to the opinion "that Jesus, who had already when but a boy of twelve years of age felt himself stirred up by the teachers of the law in Jerusalem (Luke 2:46) eagerly availed himself of all the means of education which his

1. Ibid., p. 132.

native town afforded."[1]

There is one further influence of the synagogue which must be considered. The influence of the parents and visitors in the home, as they performed the rites observed by every pious Jew, upon the child has been mentioned. Of even greater influence, especially to a boy of a religious nature whose interests turned continually to matters of religion, was the worship in the synagogue. There the people came together and the social effect intensified the feeling of awe and majesty. Jesus must have felt himself stirred time and again as he came with those whom he knew to worship on the Sabbath. As a boy he must have looked forward to the day when he might make the pilgrimage to Jerusalem and stand there in the Temple of God to worship with those who had come for this great occasion from all parts of the world. And after he had returned to Nazareth the memory remained. "Surely no one who had ever worshipped within the courts of Jehovah's house at Jerusalem could ever have forgotten the scenes he had witnessed or the words he had heard. Standing in the gorgeous building, and looking up its terraced vista, the child would watch with solemn awe, not unmingled with wonderment, as the great throng of white-robed priests busily moved about, while the smoke of the sacrifice rose from the altar of burnt-offering. Then, amid the hushed silence of that vast multitude, they had all fallen

1. Weiss, The Life of Jesus, Vol. I, p. 283.

down to worship at the time of incense. Again, on those steps that led up to the innermost sanctuary the priests had lifted their hands and spoken over the people the words of blessing; and then, while the drink offering was poured out, the Levites' chant of Psalms had risen and swelled into a mighty volume; the exquisite treble of the Levite children's voices being sustained by the rich round notes of the men, and accompanied by instrumental music. The Jewish child knew many of these words. They had been the earliest songs he had heard - almost his first lesson when clinging as a 'taph' to his mother. But now, in those white-marbled, gold adorned halls, under heaven's blue canopy, and with such surroundings, they would fall upon his ear like sounds from another world, to which the prolonged three-fold blasts from the silver trumpets of the priests would seem to waken him."[1]

This description which Edersheim gives makes one wonder how any man or boy could help being lifted up and made more worthy of the blessings which were even then accruing. But this experience fell on many hearts which could or would not respond. This must have been a fair picture of the soul of Jesus but the outward experience is not enough to explain to us the life of the man. There lay a unique personality back of the experience, a soul which appreciated, and it was this which makes more understandable the fruits which came in later years.

---

1. Edersheim, op.cit., p.108,f.

4. The Training of Fellowship.

"A powerful education, the talk of the common people, when it is absorbed by a consciousness worthy of the name!"[1] The comradeship of Jesus with his boy friends and in later years with men in the carpenter shop at Nazareth was a powerful factor in his training. Only by a careful introspection and analysis can we know how much we have absorbed from the social environment in which we live. The Jews were a people apart, yet at the time of Jesus they were forced to mingle much with the Grecian and Roman world. Case suggests that the city of Sepphoris was being built at the time Jesus worked at the carpenter trade and that perhaps he worked there. If such a supposition be true, it would mean that he came into contact with the Greek and Roman culture of the time much more extensively than would have been the case at Nazareth. Certainly his later work and his ministry around Capernaum showed a familiarity with that city; and there, too, he would make contact with others than Jews. Such experiences would broaden his vision and clarify his thinking.

The thought of Jehovah as the one and only God was his in infancy. It must have been a shock when first he realized that other peoples did not believe in Jehovah but worshipped strange gods. But it would mean that his own thinking was better grounded when he found himself able to justify

1. Borguer: op.cit., p. 136.

his beliefs and to see the superficiality of the worship of idols.

The Jewish mind was self-centered. The Jew was trained in the history of his own people and a superiority-complex developed. He did not care to know of others. It was unclean to associate with the uncircumcised. Knowing his own history so well and proud of his lineage from Abraham and David, the talk of men who were gathered together must have turned time and again to a recital of the greatness of the Hebrew people and of God's care over them. The hope of the future would often be discussed. The calamities which had come to the nation would mean a discussion of the reasons why God had inflicted these hardships upon them. Again as the season of the great feasts approached, there would be much discussion of religious matters. The hearts of the men would turn to Jehovah in praise as they looked forward to the coming pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Jesus learned much as he listened to these things and to many others. He was receptive, yet he learned to evaluate. He began to form his own judgments. There came times when he wondered if all that was commonly said about God were true. Slowly his own convictions were developed. And they were not always orthodox. "As he listened to what they were saying in the workshop in Nazareth, how many times his heart must have leaped with mingled joy and indignation."[1]

---

1. Ibid., p. 136.

5. The Training of the Out-of-Doors.

The hearts of men who live in the open seem to grow big like the great expanse which they see about them. It is from incidents in the ministry of Jesus that the inference is drawn that as a lad or young man he spent much time in the open. The Jews loved the open air. They found evidence of God in the firmament of stars.[1] They felt the hand of Jehovah in the earthquake and the flood.[2] The majesty of the mountains and the vastness of the Great Sea were attributes of God.[3] All this Jesus felt, and more. He looked at a tiny bird fallen from the nest and compassion filled his heart.[4] He saw the blue of Galilee, and the beauty of it made him certain that his Father watcheth over all. He was thrilled to his very soul by the beauty of the lilies growing wild on the hills about Nazareth,[5] and could not but compare this natural and living beauty with the costly but cold beauty of the Temple. He read in the Psalms how the Psalmists had praised God because they felt that the world and all that was therein were his handiwork.[6] But then there came to him a new revelation of Jehovah in the glory of nature which he felt in his own soul.

Even more than by the forces of inanimate nature was he moved by life. Seeing a flock of sheep, the Twenty-third Psalm came to mind, but it did not quite express his feeling. He was feeling after something new. He saw men troubled and hurt.

1. Psalm 19
2. Psalm 46
3. Psalm 121
4. Matt.10:29
5. Matt.6:28
6. Psalm 24

He saw the injustice which too often came to those who were weak or poor. And there grew within his soul the conviction that if God manifests himself in the forces of nature, surely he must much more be made manifest in life, and supremely in the lives of men. He looked at the lives of men with love in his heart. He wanted to be fair; he wanted that all the world, the fellowship of men as well as the fields and lake and mountains, should be beautiful. The open air kept his heart clean and pure, it meant that no blind prejudice and no partiality could enter there.

As he grew from boyhood to manhood, there is no reason to feel that Jesus led in any way an unusual life. He was trained just like his fellows. Many elements entered into that training. Probably, these elements were exceptional in that they were largely of the very best. But beyond that, his later life must be explained in part by his own personality. Weiss says that "for the best, which Jesus sought and found in Scripture, he required no human teacher."[1] Some things he learned of his own intuition. Likewise, for the richest understanding of life, Jesus had no teacher; he made his own estimates and judgments. Not because he made them, but because they have proved sufficient through the years, we consider his training - so far as it went - to have been good. Back of this training, "the unique religious life which he had led from childhood gave

1. Weiss, op. cit., p. 283.

him a key of sympathetic intelligence. . . and the word of Scripture explained to him that which up to this time had still unconsciously stirred within him and brought to full maturity his comprehension of that which fellowship with his Father in Heaven disclosed to him regarding the most mysterious depths of the divine Being and the divine decrees."[1]

B. Jesus and Language.

The problem of the language used by Jesus is a difficult one. There is no unanimity of opinion among scholars. Certainly the classic Hebrew was no longer the common language of the people. Aramaic was used instead. The Greek influence was strong and as the Jews of the Diaspora returned to Jerusalem they brought with them the use of Greek. Rome had opened Palestine to the world and the Greek language came with commerce. The Roman legions were undoubtedly versed in Latin, but probably also in Greek because of its prevalence throughout the world.

There is a question as to the date when the Hebrew Scripture was first translated into Aramaic. For many years it was held sacrilege to write the Scripture in any language other then the Hebrew. The Septuagint did not find immediate favor because of this fact but the necessity for its use finally overcame the opposition as many Jews born in the Diaspora must read in the Greek since they were not familiar with Hebrew, at least could not read or write it. But even if the Scriptures had

1. Ibid., p. 284.

not been translated into the Aramaic, "that an oral version of the Old Testament existed in Palestine in the first century of our era is almost certain. This is made very probable, in the first place, by the linguistic conditions of the time. The Palestinian Jews had ceased to speak Hebrew and had adopted Aramaic as their vernacular at least a hundred years before and needed an Aramaic translation for their synagogue-service and their daily life, as their Greek speaking brethren in Alexandria needed and produced a Greek translation. --- Further we should naturally be led to the same conclusion from the history of the later written Aramaic versions or targums. The line of written targums begins with that of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, about A.D. 150, after which comes Jonathan on the prophets, about 250 A.D. and then various paraphrases of the Hagiographa some time later. These written versions suppose earlier oral translations out of which they have sprung, just as the Mishna was the written record of oral explanations of the Law which had been accumulating for generations. We know from the Talmud that such oral renderings were given in the synagogues: after the scripture had been read in the original, the interpreter (meturgeman or targumist) followed with a translation into the vernacular. So far as concerns its validity as a source of New Testament quotations, it does not matter whether the version was oral or written."[1]

1. Toy, Quotations in the New Testament, p. xiv,f.

Even though Hebrew were no longer the common language of the people, it seems evident that it was used in the synagogues and Temple, for the rendering of the Scriptures. As conversant as the Jews were with their Scriptures, this must have meant that they understood this reading. No analogy can be drawn here between the Jew and the Catholic use of Latin today. For the Catholic today does not have the same reverence for the letter of the Scripture that marked the Jew, who we have seen first began to learn verses of the Law and Prophets at his mother's knee. It is more probable that the Hebrew came to be considered in a sense sacred and was not used in common speech, but that the people understood it when it was heard in the worship service and could also read it. Then the Aramaic was the language used. It would only be natural that the oral translation would be made, particularly when the people thought in Aramaic.

Edersheim thinks that Jesus taught in Aramaic and "that he used and quoted the Holy Scriptures in Hebrew, perhaps sometimes rendering them for popular use into Aramaic."[1] On the other hand Klausner regards Jesus as having no knowledge of Hebrew at all, and he contends that the only actual sayings of Jesus which we have preserved are the few Aramaic words and expressions scattered through the Gospels.[2] Burkitt cites also the word "Abba." He goes on to say that "the solemn 'Amen' at the beginning of our Lord's sayings, unfortunately trans-

1. Edersheim, op. cit., p. 118.
2. Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 235.

lated in English and turned into 'verily,' is another instance of direct reminiscence of his manner of speech."[1]

It must be remembered that the Gospels tell very explicity how Jesus was handed a roll in the synagogue in Nazareth and read there a passage from Isaiah.[2] The intimation is that it was not at all unusual for Jesus to read there. If, then, the contentions above are correct and the Scriptures, particularly those in use in formal worship, were in Hebrew, Jesus must have been able to speak both tongues and to read at least the Hebrew. This seems to be a reasonable inference.

But in addition, there are evidences which point to Jesus' knowledge of Greek, at least sufficient familiarity with it that he could use it in conversation. It is highly improbable that he could read it. In no place in the Gospels is mention made of a conversation being interpreted. There is no reason to think that any difficulty in language arose. Yet early in his ministry Jesus had a conversation and some very important dealings with a Roman centurion. Two possibilities appear. First, that the centurion could speak either Hebrew or Aramaic. Second, that Jesus could speak Latin or Greek (the assumption is made that an officer of this grade would find Greek a necessity in the colonies.) When we consider the mobility of the Roman legions, and the influx of the Greek civilization into Palestine, the latter of these two is much more probable. Again, if the

1. Burkitt, The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus, p.18.
2. Luke 4: 17,f.

supposition of Dr. Case with regard to Sepphoris has any validity, this would easily account for Jesus' knowledge. At a later time certain Greeks came seeking Jesus. Again he conversed with a Syro-Phoenician woman. And finally, Jesus before the procurator would probably have need of a knowledge of Greek. This does not point to any unusual knowledge on the part of Jesus. It is the assumption that would be made of most men of the day: that he had a reading knowledge of Hebrew, and that he had at least a speaking knowledge of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.

C. Jesus and His Written Source Material.

In a discussion of the date of the Old Testament Canon reference is often made to the New Testament for its authority on the date of certain books of the Old. When evident quotations or references are made this becomes a simple matter. But in other cases references may be vague and afford little light. This paper shall want to find certain values in the New Testament as quoted from the older canon. Hence the fact of the existence at the time of Jesus of the Old Testament or any of its parts, must be proved either by a very definite reference to these portions by Jesus, by reference to them in some book of the New Testament, apart from any words of Jesus, or by other means extraneous to the New Testament Canon.

It is generally accepted that all the books of the Old

Testament canon were written before the time of Jesus. The Jewish Council of Jamnia (circa 90 A.D.)fixed the Old Testament canon as it is known today. There is not much question but that all these books were in existence seventy years before, which would be earlier than the time of Jesus' ministry. It is evident from Acts 13:15 that the Law and the Prophets were read in the synagogue:

> "After the reading of the law and the prophets the rulers of the synagogue sent. . ."[1]

In Luke 24:44 we read,

> "All things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms. . ."[2]

It is not necessary to take time to consider the use of the further books of the Hagiographa. While mention will later be made of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Daniel, the support of these three books is in no wise essential to uphold the thesis of this paper.

Passing then from the actual existence of these books, it is necessary to consider just how familiar they were; that is, were they accessible to Jesus? It has already been shown that the Law and the Prophets were commonly read in the synagogues.

1. The Jewish divisions of the Old Testament were: 1. The Law, comprising Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy; 2. The Prophets, comprising Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Book of the Twelve, which includes the last twelve books of our Old Testament commonly known as the Minor Prophets; and 3. the Writings, comprising Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah, 1 and 2 Chronicles. In the case of Kings, Samuel, and Chronicles, the two parts in the English Bible are combined in each case into one book.
2. No attempt is being made to use this as a quotation

It has also been indicated that it was not unusual for Jesus to assume the part of the reader in the synagogue at Nazareth. This must have meant a certain familiarity with these scriptures. The internal evidence in the sayings of Jesus, which incorporate many times direct quotations from the Psalms, is sufficient proof that Jesus knew these songs and liturgies of his people.

In this modern age it is very evident that men can easily have access to books or lectures or other means of scholarship, and have it make little or no impression on them. Scholarship and pedagogical skill are not to be confused. Many a scholar does not know how to impart his learning to others. But no man can be a true scholar without giving expression to that scholarship in some way. So it is of little value to show that Jesus had access to this compilation of sacred literature, unless he made use of it. How significant that use is may be indicated by Horne's sentence, "There is such a thing as knowing. . . the Bible so well that one's literary or spoken style unconsciously reflects (its) form of expression."[1] Much the same thought comes in the following: "He was so saturated with the very words of its pages that it is sometimes difficult to tell whether he is citing a passage or merely putting his own thoughts in phrases that the prophets had used."[2] This is sufficient evidence to support the assertion that Jesus knew at least that part of the

from Jesus, but it is cited simply to show that at the time of the writing of Luke, these portions of the Old Testament were regarded as familiar.

1. Horne, H. H., Jesus the Master Teacher, p. 100.
2. Branscomb, The Message of Jesus, p. 35.

Jewish Scriptures which is called the Law, the Prophets, and the Book of Psalms.

In addition to the books which were canonized at the Council of Jamnia there were a great number of writings of a religious nature which were not included in the canon. In the Second Book of Esdras (14:44-46) mention is made of ninety-four sacred writings, which included the twenty-four that became the canon. While the story as given in Esdras is not to be credited, we may have a general indication as to the number of books which were more or less known. At least it is very evident that a large number did exist. Some of these - those of the higher type - have been incorporated into the Old Testament Apocrypha.

In the Septuagint the Apocryphal books are found scattered among those later to be canonized. However, in Palestinian Judaism, this would not be the case for their law prohibited the writing of different parts of the several sections of the sacred literature on the same scroll. This made it easy for the Apocrypha to be kept separate in Palestine. It came to be generally accepted that prophecy ceased with Malachi. The scribes dated the Apocrypha later and hence these writings were credited with no divine inspiration but were merely the history of the times written by human means. Certainly some of the history they contained was well known, but it might have been handed down orally. Just how general was their distribution among the

Palestinian Jews at the time of Jesus is very difficult to say. The only approach left is through the internal evidence of his own words.

Various authors have found suggestions from certain passages in the sayings of Jesus which seem to indicate his familiarity with parts of the Apocrypha. Among them are the following:

Matt. 5:4	Tobit 13:14
Matt. 5:34, 35.	Ecclestiasticus 23:9
Matt. 5:42.	" 4:4,5; 29:2
Matt. 6:12,14	" 28:2
Matt. 7:12.	Tobit 4:15 and The Wisdom of Solomon

If any familiarity is indicated by the similarity of thought which is found here, it could have been oral, and nothing in the above is sufficient to prove that Jesus had available the rolls of the Apocryphal literature. Plummer suggests the possibility that Jesus knew this literature, either oral or written, when he says: "That address πάτερ ὑμῶν has no parallel in the Old Testament. There God is spoken of as the Father of the Jewish nation (Dt.32:6; Is.63:16; Jer.3:4,19; 31:9; Mal.1:6; 2:10); but He is nowhere called the Father of individuals. This step is taken in the Apocrypha. (Wis.2:6; 14:3; Sir. 23:1,4; 51:10; Tobit 13:4; 3 Mac. 6:3.)"[1] This tracing of an idea is not conclusive. First, it allows no originality of thought to Jesus, and secondly, it does not take cognizance of the fact

1. A.Plummer, in H.B.D., Article "Lord's Prayer." Vol. III, p. 143.

that Jesus' use of the expression "Our Father" carried connotations and meanings which are found nowhere even in the Apocryphal literature.

The history of the Maccabees was of such intense interest to the Jews of His day, however, that it must be assumed that these tales were told to the boys as they were growing to manhood. Surely Jesus knew of the accounts which appear in this section of the Apocrypha. And it would probably be a safe venture to say that he likewise knew of most of this collection.[1]

Mention must be made of another source of knowledge which was available to Jesus. We have already indicated that a great deal of Jewish history and law, as well as their liturgical Psalms and hymns, were handed down orally from one generation to another. There grew up a great volume of tradition which consisted of the oral interpretations by the priests of the Law of Moses. The schools of the rabbis were burdened with the mass of this constantly growing body of interpretation. It was known as the Talmud, and at the time of Jesus it was customary for each decision to be headed with the words "Rabbi _____ says. . ." The common people could not know all of this, but they did feel its burden. Many times they did not know what the law really required because of the conflicting opinions which had come to them. Again, they learned to evade the spirit of the

1. It will be shown later, see page 61, that Jesus made reference to certain writings which are not now extant. We are not trying to set a limit on the extent of Jesus' familiarity with written documents, but rather to show the certainty of his extensive acquaintance, and then to indicate that it is reasonable to credit him with even more than we can prove.

law through these same decisions, and the priests were powerless or did not care to stop them. Of course, every Jew must by the very nature of things, decide whether he would deliberately evade the spirit, although fulfilling the letter of the law, or whether he would seek to know its real meaning. This much discrimination was unavoidable, although no deep thinking need enter into the decision. Jesus felt the burden. He faced the issue squarely in his own life. As a scholar, he thought through. The results of that thinking will be made evident later, as will also be his opinion regarding the evasion of the spirit of the Law of Moses by certain classes of his fellow countrymen.

From the childhood of Jesus, at the very beginning of the educative procees, we have traced his life in the schools which were available, his training in society, and have estimated the probable availability of the literature of the day. The literature was not at all extensive. It has only been in recent years that a scholar (as indicated by Mr. Austin in his Harvard address, page 3 supra) could pick and choose among a great mass of available material. The printing press revolutionized scholarship. But for the Jew, the learned man (rabbi) needed to know only the history, laws, and literature of his own race. They were a self-centered people. Much of this was available to Jesus, either in written form or orally. And that which was oral

was the best of the tradition which was not available in writing. It was preserved orally only because it did prove its worth to the people. Jesus did not have the doubtful benefit of rabbinic training. He did not spend his time learning the Talmud and Torah by rote. But there is every reason to believe that he knew and loved the best of the Sacred Literature of his people, that he was acquainted with the history of the Hebrew nation, that he understood the spirit and the letter of the unwritten laws, and particularly, that he was able to evaluate all this and so form judgments which have stood the test of opposition and of time.

CHAPTER II

JESUS' USE OF HIS KNOWLEDGE IN DIRECT QUOTATION OR IN REFERENCES.

It has been shown that "the knowledge of books may come to one either directly or indirectly. They may be known either through one's own reading of them, or through one's contact with people who had read them for themselves."[1] Either of these methods combined with a good memory on the part of Jesus could easily account for the use of "some well-known - perhaps ere this, stock - quotations."[2] Just how much quoting did Jesus do?

In making a search through the Gospels for quotations in the sayings of Jesus, a division of such passages is found to be necessary. First, there are those passages which are evidently literary quotations, either verbally accurate or so nearly so that they must be accepted. Secondly, there are a great many passages in which the thought closely resembles what has been written elsewhere. There is a great deal more difficulty in dealing with this latter type. As will be seen, often a word of Jesus may be quite similar to the thought expressed in two or more passages in the Old Testament, or other old Hebrew literature.

From the standpoint of Rabbinic scholarship, the more evidence of quotation from ancient authorities that can be found

1. Walker, , What Jesus Read, p. 13.
2. Ibid., p. 13.

the stronger the evidence of the scholarship of Jesus. But modern scholarship is not satisfied with an appeal only to what others have thought or said. A child can learn to repeat passages without any understanding of their meaning. Scholarship demands that there shall be discrimination in the selection of passages used. And the further necessity for an evaluation and interpretation is manifest. These later considerations will be discussed in Chapter III. The aim of the present chapter is a survey of the sayings of Jesus with a view to finding what he quoted from his source material.

Two schools of thought prevail among those who have made intensive study of this subject. The orthodox Jewish view may represent the one. Probably the best exponent of this side of the question is Gerald Friedlander. In an attempt to prove that Jesus was in no way original, Friedlander proves too much. He has picked the Sermon on the Mount to pieces. Modern scholarship looks to the author of Matthew as a compiler but Friedlander makes Jesus a compiler _par excellence_. In seeking to take from him any claim to originality, he has placed him in the same category as the old Jewish rabbi. He has entirely overlooked the fact that, even if all the claims to source material be admitted, still Jesus was certainly considered by the Jews of the time to be presenting something entirely new in thought. Even if Jesus used old words and phrases and so made his teachings more understandable to the common people of his day, surely in some way he gave them a meaning which not only was new but which aroused a great

deal of antagonism. Friedlander's book[1] gives the following extensive list of material as the basis for the thoughts of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount.

Matthew	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources
5:3		Ps.1:1 (Thirty sentences Cf.Ps.41:1(in the Old Testa- Is.11:4(ment begin with the Is.57:15(word "happy") Ps.36:18, cf.Ps.51:17 and Is.66:2
5:4		Is.40:1; 56:18; 60:20; cf.51:11; Ps.126:5; 94:12,13; cf.66:13; Tobit 13:14
5:5	Ps. 37:11	Ps.25:13; Cf.Didache 3:7 Enoch 6:9; cf.Isa.60:21
5:6		Philo (Mangey 2:651) Ps.42:2, cf. Jer. 23:6 Deut.16:20; Isa.32:17; 51:1; Ps.22:26; Prov.21:21; 15:9
5:7		Ps.41:1 Prov.14:21 Talmud (Sabbath 151b)
5:8		Ps.24:4; 73:1; 7:10; 11:7; Ps.17:15; 97:11
5:9		Isa.52:7, cf.Zech.7:16,17,19; Ps.34:14; Prov.12:20 Hillel (Aboth 1:12) Sirach 4:10
5:10		Isa.50:6,7; Cf.51:7,12.
5:11		Isa.51:7 (origin not a parallel)
5:12		
5:13		Cf.Lev.2:13 and Job 6:6 also Zech.13:9
5:14-16		Isa.42:6; Cf. 49:6 and 40:3; Isa.2:2.
5:17-19		Deut.4:2; Canticles Rabba 5,11; Ps.102:25,26.
5:21-22	Exod.5:21	Exod.20:13; Lev.19:17,18 and Cf.Gen.9:6; Deut.23:7; Aboth 3:15; Num.20:10; Gad 4:6; 5:5; Deuch Eretz 6; Ps.15:3

1. Friedlander: Jewish Sources for the Sermon on the Mount,

5:23-24		Hos.6:6; Lev.5:15-16.
5:25-26		Gen. Rab. 82:8; Aboth 4:29.
5:27-28	Ex. 20:14; Deut 5:18	Cf. Job 24:15; Num. Rab. 8:5; Job 31:1ff.; Gen. 49:7ff.
5:27-28		Num. 15:39
5:29-30		
5:31-32		Gen. 2:24; Strom. 3,9:63; Ibid., 15, 97; Gen. Rab. 17:2; Deuch. Eretz 11; Deut. 22:19; Cf. 22:29; Malachi 2:15--2:14.
5:33-37		Exod. 20:7; Exod. 20:16; Deut. 6:13; Lev. 19:11; Exod. 23:7; Acclus. 23:9-11; Lev. 19:12, Num. 30:2; Deut. 23:21; Num. R. 22:1.
5:38--42	Lev. 24:20 Deut. 19:21 Ex. 21:24	Lev. 19:18; Prov. 20:22; 24:29; Lam. 3:30, Job 16:10; Ecclus. 28:1,2; Aboth 3:16; Gad 4:3f., Lev. 25:35,36; Ecclus 4:4,5.
5:43--48	Lev. 19:34; 19:18	Gen. 5:1; Ibid., 17:2; Prov. 25:21; Job 31;:29,30;
5:43-48		Jer. 29:7; Deut. R. 6:9; Levi. 4:2; Gen. 1:27; Cf. also Aboth 3:18; Apol. 2:10; Apol. 46; Deut. 32:6; Amos 9:7; Ps. 103:13; Deut. 11:21; Deut. 14:4; Deut. 4:4; Ps. 145:18; Mishna Aboda Zora 4:7; Exod. 23:4,5; Prov. 20:22; Ibid., 24:29; Deut. 18:13; Lev. 19:2; Lev. 19: 3,4,5; Tosephta Synhedrin 13:2.
6:1		Joel 2:13
6:2		Tosephta Nidda 9:16,17: Ibid. 23:27; Ibid., 23:33, Ibid. 12:39; Ibid., 14:14; Prov. 21:14; Eccles. 12:14; Deut.15:9,10; Mishna Shekalim 5:6; Tosephta Shekalim 2:16; Tosephta Pea 4:19 also 4:21; Jer. 16:5 Cf. Zebulun 6:4-7 and Issachar 3:8--11

6:5,6	Jalkut Psalm 9:9 Tana de bi Elijahu 22; Isaiah 26:20,21; H. Tephillah 11:21; Megillah 26a; Maimonides, Hilekoth Keli, 6:1,2; cf. Rosh Hashana 3,8. Ps. 4:4
6:7.8	I Kings 18:26; Ecclus. 7:14; Ecclesiastes 5:2; Aboth 2:18; Ps. 145:18; Deut. 6:5; Num. 12:13; Prov. 13:12; Lev. 16:29; Zech. 8:19; Zeb. 8:6 also see Jos.3:4.
6:9--15	I Kings 8:28; Ps. 103:13; Hos. 11:1; Solomon 14:3; Ecclus. 23:1; Ex. 4:22; Jama 8:9; Deut. 32:6; Isa. 63:16--64:8; Deut. 32:6; Isa. 63:16; Isa. 64:8; Jer. 3:4--19; 31:9; Mal. 1:6--2:10; Ps.115:3 and cf.Ps. 2:4.
6:10	Zech. 14:9; Exod. 15:18; Sirach 36:2; Ibid., 36:5; Isa. 69:6; 56:23; Mic. 5:7; Exod. 19:6; Zech 19:9; Aboth 2:4., Ibid., 5:23; Ps. 143:10; Ps. 19; Neh. 9:6; Ecclus. 16:26-28; 43:6; Enoch 2:1; Solomon 18--last 3 verses. I Macc. 3:60; Ps. 51:11; Joel 2:28; Ezek. 37:14; Isa. 29:24; Mal. 3:3; M. Sota 9:15; Ezek. 36:25-27; I Sam. 7:6; Prov. 30:8; Exod. 16:4; Isa. 33:16; Shekalim 3:2. Ben Sirach 38:2; Zeb. 5:3 cf. 8:1,2 Jos. 18:2; Exos. 16:4; Sirach 15:11-17; 2:6--33:1; Gen. 8:21--6:5; 4:7; Aboth 4:2; Gad 5:3; I Chron. 29:11; Ezek. 36:23-31.
6:19-34	Hab. 2:9; Levi. 13:5; Naph. 8:5; Gen. 1:31; Prov. 23: 4,5--22:1,2. Ibid., 14:24; Ps. 49; Malachi 3:11; Ps. 62:10 Job 31:24; Ecclus.31:8,10,11. Hag. 2:8; Prov. 18:23; Deut. 3:23-26; Aboth 4:1,21.

6:22-23	Aboth 5:16; 2:13, 14. Prov. 22:9; Ibid., 23:6,7; Prov. 28:22; Prov. 20:27; Job 18:5,6; Prov. 13:9; Ecclus. 35:8; Issachar 3:4; Benjamin 4:2,3.
6:24	Judah 18:6--19:1; Genesis 3:19--2:15; Ibid., 6:19.
6:25	Isa. 26:3; Exod. 20:9; Ps. 34:9,10. 2 Esdras 2:27.
6:26	Ps. 145:15,16; cf. Gen. 2:19; Ps. 79:2; 104:11,12; Job 35:11; Ps. 8; Job 12:7; Jeremiah 50:26; Ps. 103: 13,14. Prov. 16:3; Ps. 55: 22--37:5;
6:32	Ps. of Solomon 4 and 5. Ibid., 13 x 6; cf. Ps. of Sol. 8:13; Gen. 3:7.
7:1	Ibid. 5:44; Aboth 1:6 and cf. Shebanth 30a; Aboth 2:5
7:2	Test. Zebulun 5:3; Ibid. 8:1--3
7:6	Aboth 1:11; Prov. 11:24; Ps. 119:126; Tosephta Berachath 7:24; cf. Megill Ex. 12:6; Exodus 12:16--22:31
7:7,8	Ps. 103:13; Eccles. 18:13; 2 Esdras 8:47; Is. 49:14,15; Deut. 32:7; Ps. 2:8;
7:9	Prov. 8:17; Jer. 29:13; Is. 60:6; I Chron. 28:9; II Chron. 15:2.
7:12	Lev. 19:18; Tobit 4:15; Aboth 2:15; Aboth 2:17; Eccles. 31:15; Gen. 5:1; Siphra Kedoshim 100:4; Gen. Rabba 24:7.
7:13-27	Gen. 2:9-17; Ibid. 3:22--24.
7:13	Prov. 3:18--9:30; 13:12; 15:4; Prov. 10:11--13:14-27; 16:22; Ps. 36:9; 118:17; Siphra Achre Moth 13:13; Micah 6:8; Gen. 4:7; Deut. 30:15,16., Ibid. 55:19,20. Jer. 21:8; Ps. 5:6; Ps. 16:11; Prov. 6:23; Barnabas 18; Ps. 9:13; Nandstum 5:1; Hosea 2:15; Moreh Nebuelim 3:22;

	Gen. 4:7; Job 38:17; Deut. 30:19; Ezek. 18:21; Mal. 3:7; Job 8:3; Esdras 8:3,47; Ibid. 29:22--24:--25:24; Ibid., 15:19; 17:14; 2-8:44; 12:31--14:30--16:11; 5:21; 6:65, cf.6:44; 6:37,39,35--13:1--15:19--17,6,14,16, 17, 9 Cf. 3:15, 36--5:24.
7:13--27	6:40,54; 8:12; Tosephta Synhedrin 13:2.
7:14	Deut. 18:22; Jer. 14:14; Ezekiel 22:27; Zech. 13:4; Ibid. 5:23.
7:16-20	Gen. 3:18; Joel 2:22; Asher 1:6,9; Eccles. 17:6; Slavonic Enoch 42:14; Jer. 17:8--Ps. 1:3. Gen. Rabba 16:3--30:6; Yalkut Isa. 7:2; Prov. 11:30.
7:21--23	Ps. 6:8; Isa. 2:11,17.
7:24--27	Ezekiel 13:10--14; Prov. 1:26--33--12:7; 14:11; Exod. 19:8; Isa. 59:21; Deut. 18:22; Aboth 1:17; Jahicher 2 p.260.
7:28	Hileloth Melachim 11:4, Cf. Kizai 4:23

That Jesus had any idea of using all this great mass of material as a basis for what he had to say is unthinkable. It is possible, however, that he had absorbed a great deal of it into his life and that it thus became a background for his thinking. It must never be forgotten that this thinking portrayed the man himself far more than it did his sources. What it offers as a possibility for the background of Jesus' thinking only goes to prove that the man is greater than anything which has been said about him.

The old orthodox view which is presented above is not

held widely today. It may well be compared with the list of references as given by Toy. He lists possible quotations and references by Jesus[1] in the Sermon on the Mount as twelve. All of these are to be found in the fifth chapter of Matthew's Gospel. The other two chapters are considered to be original in the thinking of Jesus. A complete exhibit of the quotations and and references, representing Jesus' use of the Old Testament, according to Toy, follows:[2]

Old Testament	Matthew	Mark	Luke
Genesis			
1:27	*19:4	*10:6	
2:24	*19:5	*10:7,8	
5:2	*19:4	10:6	
18:14		10:27	1:37
Exodus			
3:6,15	*22:32	*12:26	
20:7	(5:33 (*19:18		
20:12	(*15:4 (*19:19	(*7:10 (*10:19	*18:20
20:12-17	*19:18,19	*10:19	*18:20
20:13	(*5:21 (*19:18	*10:19	*18:20
20:14	*5:27	*10:19	*18:20
21:17	15:4		
21:24	5:38		
Leviticus			
19:12	*5:33		
19:18	(*5:43 (19:19 (*22:39	*12:31	*10:27
24:30	*5:38		
Numbers			
30:2	(*533 (19:16		

1. No attempt is made here to separate direct quotation from references, since it is felt that they have equal weight, when proved, to establish the point of this paper.
2. Toy, Quotations in the New Testament. The passages in the Gospels which are prefixed by a star (*) are direct quotations. Other passages contain references to the Old Testament passages cited.

Deuteronomy			
5:16	(15:4 (19:19	(7:10 (10:19	18:20
5:17	(5:21 (19:18	10:19	18:20
5:18	(5:21 (19:18	10:19	18:20
6:4,5	*22:37	12:29,30	
6:13	*4:10		*4:8
6:16	*4:7		*4:12
8:3	*4:4		*4:4
19:15	18:16		
19:21	5:38		
23:21	(5:33 (19:18		
24:1	5:31		
Psalms			
8:3	*21:16		
8:7	22:44	12:36	20:42,43
18:26	5:7		
22:1	*27:46	*15:34	
24:3-5	5:8		
31:5			*23:46
37:11	5:5		
42:5	26:38	14:34	
110:1	*22:44	*12:36	*21:42,43
118:22,23	*21:42	*12:10,11	*20:17
118:26	*23:38		
Proverbs			
11:17	5:7		
24:12	16:27		
Ecclesiastes			
12:2	24:29	13:24	21:25,26
Isaiah			
5:1,2	21:33	12:2	20:9
6:9,10	*13:14,15	(4:12 (8:18	8:10
8:14	21:44		
14:13-15	11:23		20:18
29:13	*15:8,9	*7:6,7	
53:12			*22:37
55	5:6		6:21
56:7	*21:13	*11:17	*19:46
61:1,2			*4:18,19
61:2	5:4		
66:24		*9:48	*6:21

Jeremiah			
7:11	21:13	11:17	19:46
Daniel			
4:9	13:32	4:32	13:19
7:13	(24:30	(13:26	(21:27
	(26:64	(14:62	(22:69
8:10	24:29	13:24	21:25,26
9:27	24:15	13:14	21:20
12:1	24:31	13:19	21:22
Hosea			
6:6	(*9:13		
	(*12:7		
Joel			
4:16	24:29	13:24	21:25,26
Micah			
7:7		*13:12	*12:53
Zech.			
13:7	*26:31	*14:27	
Malachi			
3:1	*11:10		*7:27

Summary--Number of References

Genesis	3	4	1
Exodus	12	7	4
Leviticus	6	1	1
Numbers	1	0	0
Deuteronomy	15	5	6
Psalms	10	5	4
Proverbs	2	0	0
Ecclesiastes	1	1	1
Isaiah	8	6	8
Jeremiah	1	1	1
Daniel	6	6	6
Hosea	2	0	0
Joel	1	1	1
Micah	0	1	1
Zechariah	1	1	0
Malachi	1	0	1
	70	39	35

In this exhibit, references are made by Matthew to 57 passages in the Old Testament, and 34 each by Mark and Luke. However, it would probably be a fairer count to combine all the references to Exodus 21:12-17 (four in each case) and to Deuteronomy 5:16-18 (three in each case). Combining these passages, Toy then shows Matthew as making reference to 52 Old Testament passages, Mark as making reference to 29 Old Testament passages, and Luke as making reference to 29 Old Testament passages. Or if this same combination is used, the Synoptic Gospels indicate that Jesus either quoted or referred to 57 passages in the Old Testament.

In this list are found passages from the books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Daniel. These three books were not mentioned in the consideration of the books available to Jesus. They have been included here because Toy feels that these references are authentic. It will be noted that none of the passages cited in these three is a direct quotation. The matter must rest on the internal evidence. The references to Daniel depend largely on the interpretation of Jesus' thought on Jewish Apocalypse. The eight passages cited in the three books do not affect the thesis of this paper so they will not be considered further.

In addition to the quotations and direct references which are traceable to the Old Testament, there are many allusions to Old Testament passages and to Jewish history, which are recorded there. These allusions cannot be definitely referred

to chapter or verse and sometimes they might refer to one or more different books. The following list will indicate their extent.

1. Persecution of the prophets (Matt. 5:12).
2. Tittle of the law (Matt. 5:18).
3. The glory of Solomon (Matt. 6:29, Luke 12:27).
4. Gift that Moses commanded (Matt. 8:4).
5. Those who sit down with Abraham (Matt. 8:11).
6. Sodom and Gomorrah (Matt. 10:15).
7. A man's foes (Matt. 10:36).
8. Tyre and Sidon (Matt. 11:21,22, Luke 10:13,14).
9. This is Elijah (Matt. 17:12, 11:14).
10. What David did (Matt. 12:3).
11. How the priests profane Sabbath (Matt. 12:5).
12. Jonah and Nineveh (Matt. 12:40). Luke 11:29-32).
13. The Queen of the South (Matt. 12:42).
14. The blood of Abel (Matt. 23:35, Luke 11:51).
15. Tombs of the prophets (Matt.23:23, Luke 11:42).
16. Tithe mint and anise (Matt. 23:23, Luke 11:42).
17. Desire of prophets to see (Matt.13:16,17, Luke 10:23,24).
18. Morning of the tribes of the earth (Matt.24:30)
19. Sign of the Son of Man in Heaven (Matt.24:30).
20. The days of Noah (Matt.24:37).
21. Sitting at the right hand of power (Matt.26:64).
22. The widows of Israel (Luke 4:25).
23. The lepers of Israel (Luke 4:27).
24. Days of Lot (Luke 17:28).
25. Lot's wife (Luke 17:32).
26. Searching the Scriptures (John 5:39).
27. Moses "Wrote of Me." (John 5:46).
28. Witness of two men (John 8:17).
29. Ascending and descending angels (John 1:51).
30. Lifting up the serpent (John 3:14).
31. The bond servant in the house (John 8:35).
32. Rejoicing of Abraham (John 8:56).

There is no positive quotation by Jesus from the Apocryphal Old Testament writings. The possible references to these works have been listed in Chapter II.[1]

---

1. Walker: What Jesus Read, Appendix, pp.99,ff., gives a great mass of material comparing certain of the apocalyptic and apocryphal writings with the sayings of Jesus. He goes to an extreme almost as much as Friedlander's sources of the Sermon on the Mount. But if one wants to compare similar words and phrases without regard to context or idea, a similarity can easily be established.

Another group of Jewish writings must be considered. This is the Apocalyptic literature. Daniel, parts of Isaiah and Zechariah are the chief Apocalyptic writing to be canonized in the Old Testament.[1] The more important of the other writings of this class, which were probably written in Palestine before the time of Jesus and which may possible have been known by him are: Ethiopic Enoch, Slavonic Enoch (this is doubtful, however), Ascension of Isaiah, The Book of Jubilees, Assumption of Moses, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Psalms of Solomon.[2] Friedlander's sources for the Sermon on the Mount, supra, makes reference to these Apocalyptic writings several times. However, there is no use of them sufficiently definite to assert positively that they were available to Jesus. Klausner says that Jesus may have known the Book of Enoch,[3] but this is based largely on the interpretation which he gives to the apocryphal utterances of Jesus. Some light is throwm on the transfiguration experience of Jesus in the light of these works. The Ascension of Isaiah tells of the death of the prophet as a martyr.[4] The end of the Assumption of Moses

1. Haggai, Joel, and Malachi also contain apocalyptic passages.
2. The Apocalypse of Baruch should not be confused with the Apocryphal Book of Baruch. The main part of the former was written after the fall of Jerusalem and so this writing has not been included in the list of Apocalyptic works. However, there is a possibility that a portion of this work may have been in existence and have been known by Jesus.
3. Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 237. The theory of demons and demoniacal possession implied in Matt. 12:43-45 (Lk. 11:24--26) is the same as that set forth in Enoch. The Judgment scene of Matt. 25:31ff. has a parallel in Enoch 62.
4. The Talmud also has a legend of the martyrdom of Isaiah.

has been lost. It is very probable that this portion told of the death of the patriarch. If the story of Moses' death makes him also a martyr then the appearance of Moses on the Mount of Transfiguration, as Jesus is looking toward Jerusalem and thinking of his own fate as a martyr's death, becomes very logical.

While sections of certain of these old writings have been lost, it is certain that whole documents which existed in the time of Jesus, and earlier, are unknown to us. If we could find the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel and Judah, perhaps we might understand certain historical references which now are vague. Mark 9:13 reads:

> Elijah is come and they have also done unto him whatsoever they would, even as it is written of him.

If this writing were available, even more light might be shed on the transfiguration which is mentioned above, for there is at least a suggestion here that Elijah did not fare well at the hands of his contemporaries. Or if we consider the reference to the coming of Elijah as a reference to John the Baptist, the transfiguration becomes explicable when the fate of John is remembered.

Bacon[1] feels that a certain type of literature which he designates as the work of the so-called "Wisdom" writers or the sages of Israel is among that which is lost to us, and that Jesus knew and used this. He cites Matthew 11:25b,ff. as an instance of this and feels that it is a quoted Hymn of Wisdom:

---

1. Bacon, Jesus, the Son of God

I praise Thee, Father, Lord of Heaven and earth
That Thou didst hide these things from the wise
and understanding
And didst reveal them to 'babes;'
Yes, Father, for such was Thy elective decree.

My revelation is all from the Father.
Only the Father knows whom he chooses as 'sons.'
And none has knowledge of the Father
Save he to whom the 'son' is pleased to make Him known.[1]

Again, Luke 11:49 is given as another quotation from the Wisdom literature:

Behold I sent unto you prophets and wise men and scribes,
Some ye will kill and crucify,
Some ye will scourge in your synagogues and persecute
from city to city,
That upon you may come all the righteous blood
shed upon the earth,
From the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah
Whom ye slew between temple and altar.[2]

And Matthew 11:28-29b is considered to have its source in Ben Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) chapter 51. Bacon says that this also is a "beautiful invitation of the Wisdom of God."[3]

A number of definite references are made by Jesus in which the source cannot be determined.

1. "Son of Man, even as it is written of him." Written--where? Matt. 26:24, Mark 9:12.
2. "For the Son of man goeth, even as it is written of him." Again, written where? Mark 14:21. There is a possibility that Jesus is influenced here by the thought of the Servant of Jehovah. Cf. Isaiah 53.
3. "How then should the Scriptures be fulfilled." What Scriptures? Matt. 26:54.
4." But all this is come to pass that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled." What prophets? Matt. 26:56.

---

1. Ibid., p. 74.
2. Ibid., p. 72, Bacon's translation of verses 49a-51a.
3. Ibid., p. 76.

5. "Elijah is come and they have also done unto him whatsoever they would, even as it is written of him." Written where? Mark 9:13.
6. "Therefore, said the Wisdom of God, I will send unto them prophets and apostles." Where? Wisdom of God? Luke 11:49.
7. "For these are days of vengeance, that all things that are written may be fulfilled." What things? Luke 21:22.
8. "He that believed on me, as the Scriptures hath said, from him shall flow rivers of living waters." In what Scriptures? John 7:38.
9. "Not one of them perished but the son of Perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled." What Scripture? John 17:12.

These citations show conclusively that Jesus many times made reference to events in the history of Israel, both directly and indirectly. Further, he must have been acquainted with certain writings which have been lost to us. Because of this fact it is evidently impossible to say that he made any quotations from them but surely he did refer to them and the references are sufficiently numerous to make us feel that he attached considerable importance to them. And, finally, he seems to have had some acquaintance with the Apocryphal and Apocalyptic literature of the Jews. But all the combined references to these extra-canonical sources are meagre when compared with his use of the literature which was later canonized. It is evident that the mind of Jesus was largely in agreement with the minds of the members of the Council of Jamnia later. The fact that both Jesus and this Council were influenced by the traditions does not detract from the evidence of their discernment.

"The indebtedness of Jesus to his own ancient church is

very difficult to over-estimate. With the Old Testament in front of us, and the Jewish Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and, less directly, the Rabbinical literature now at our disposal, it is getting to be a comparatively easy matter to make the estimate with not inconsiderable accuracy."[1] In view of the religious teachings which Jesus received in the orthodox manner and of the opportunities which were his for knowing the sacred literature of his people, "the claim for originality which is made on behalf of Jesus must be made with greater caution than hitherto. Obviously, many of the things which have been claimed for him were native to the best Judaism of his day. This is a happy discovery, and, on the whole, should perhaps have been made sooner. It makes it much easier to account for the rise of Jesus."[2]

If this were all, we might leave Jesus much like the man who was pictured by Friedlander. But this is the story only of the sources. Which is the very beginning of a sketch of scholarship. The next chapter will deal with the use which Jesus made of this material and will open up some of the original ideas which were his.

---

1. Walker, op.cit., p. 22.
2. Ibid., p. 57.

CHAPTER III

THE BROADER ASPECTS OF JESUS' SCHOLARSHIP

The world owes much to the scholars of the Middle Ages. They went apart from the world to be alone. They were concerned with the salvation of their own souls. In the accomplishment of this purpose they spent much time in meditation and in copying old documents. Their monasteries served as repositories for the old copies of Scriptures. But we do not know the names of the men who spent their days in this work. Because their scholarship was so narrowed and they did not seek to influence their own times, they lost the greater part of their influence. The world had been much richer had they supplemented the work of writing and the hours of meditation with service to humanity, putting into actual use the knowledge which they possessed. But cramped as they were, they were not able to interpret in a broad sense the things which they read or wrote. They found a subjective meaning, but there was no objective reality in their learning.

The technical aspects of the scholarship of Jesus have been considered. They have come first because they lay a foundation for what is to follow. The heart of the man would have made of him a great servant of his fellowman even had he not been privileged to possess the rich cultural

heritage of the Jewish sacred literature. But it would have been impossible for him to make the same impact upon his people or to influence life as deeply as his did, without this knowledge. It was because he had studied, because he had interpreted and evaluated the oral and written traditions that he was able to speak so that men said, "He speaks as one having authority."

It is to be noted that, in all the condemnation which was heaped upon Jesus, he was never accused of being a fool. The scribes and Pharisees felt that he blasphemed, but it was always from his firm convictions. They had no doubt that he was in his right mind. They dealt with a man who was wise and who was the more dangerous because his wisdom made the basis of their position untenable.

The broader aspects of scholarship require that it shall be related to life. One who has knowledge alone, and does not know how to use it, is simply a learned fool. True scholarship, thus, is not based solely on knowledge, but also on the ability to interpret and evaluate. Jesus' life will now be considered in this light.

A. Jesus as a Critical Scholar - His Interpretation

Much has been written about this aspect of the life of Jesus. Since the church has been seeking to go directly to the life of the Man of Nazareth, books have come out by

the score. It is impossible to consider all that Jesus said. While all his words could be used either to prove or disprove scholarship, it is necessary in the scope of this paper to use only so much as will set forth its thesis. Hence the material is selected with no pretense to be exhaustive. That is the work of the commentator. The evidence for belief in the critical scholarship of Jesus will be presented under four heads: 1. His criticism of Jewish legalism and of the customs of his day. 2. His attitude toward the state. 3. His interpretation of religious values, and 4. His world vision.

1. Jesus' Criticism of Jewish Legalism and Tradition.

The Decalogue is a masterpiece of legal writing. It sets before men the principles on which life should be built. It may well be compared to the Magna Charta of British liberty or to the Constitution of the United States. True, it is largely written in the negative, but its basic principles are sound. It held much of its authority because of the supposed Mosaic authorship, which meant that Moses had received the word directly from God and had written at his command.

Mixing with other tribes and absorbing much from superior civilizations in the occupancy of Canaan, Israel also absorbed much which was far from good. She neglected God. The morals of the people were corrupted. The Decalogue was forgotten or ignored. From this state of affairs grew the necessity for laws regulating in minute detail the life of the people. The discovery of the scroll in the Temple and

its ascription to Jehovah[1], gave divine authorship and authority to Deuteronomy. Here we find the beginning of the Jewish legalism. From an institution meant to reform the customs of the people, it gradually developed a class who ruled through the interpretation of the law which was handed down. The Decalogue was short enough to serve as a foundation. It set forth principles. But when the enlarged code came, it was made as inflexible as the principles on which it was built. Israel did not see the difference between the eternal principle of right and the application of that principle to the changing conditions found from one age to another. They did not make any allowance for a growing conception of morality on the part of man. They believed that it was an all-knowing God who had given their laws and so they could not change. It was inevitable that under such a system, they should accomodate their actions to the letter of the law, with no regard to its spirit.

Here the scholarship of Jesus becomes evident. He took issue with the legalistic system of his day. He knew what the law said. He also knew enough of the interpretations of the scribes to realize that they were more concerned with the letter than with the spirit. He would cut away all superfluous trapping and come to the heart of the moral law. He saw the necessity for change in the details of government as the people grew in knowledge. He

1. 2 Kings 22:8-13

sensed the fact of the development of the nation much as an individual develops from childhood into maturity.

Using Matthew's Gospel where this attitude of Jesus is shown by a compilation of his sayings, we find in the Sermon on the Mount sufficient evidence to substantiate what has been said. In order to escape the charge of tearing down the institution which had served, Jesus began with the statement:

> Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy but to fulfill.[1]

He continued:

> Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say unto you. . .[2]

The idea, which has entered into certain church creeds, that Jesus would broaden the meaning of murder to include the taking of any life, animal as well as human, is without foundation. Jesus did look at the law of life, and saw that here he must deal with one of the most sacred things given of God to men. But he also saw that, after all, life in its fullness meant more than the beating of the heart and the functioning of the organs of the body. His discerning judgment would say that the man with murder in his heart was just as guilty as he who struck the blow which killed. In all his teaching he carried this a step farther, to im-

---

1. Matt. 5:17.
2. Matt. 5:21,22a.

press on people that life must be made worth while. This sacred gift of God must be used to the best advantage.

A second instance is presented as Jesus continued:

> Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, ...[1]

The same form of reasoning is used here. There mere literal obedience to the law is not enough. It is the end to be achieved by the cleansing of the heart of all desire to commit sin. The soul which lusts is guilty. The way to moral cleanness is through clean thinking.

This naturally led to the next thought which is presented:

> Again, ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shall perform unto the Lord thy oaths: but I say unto you, Swear not at all; . . .[2]

If the heart were clean, then the words which are spoken will be clean, and true. It is not from the mouth that blasphemy and uncleanness arise, but from the heart. It is not the physical things of the earth which contaminate and make men unclean, but the ideas and thought which enter their minds. But when all minds are clean before God, then the spoken word will always be true and may be taken at its full worth without wild exaggerations which are supposed to convince the hearer of the truth of that which is spoken.

When conditions like this prevail, then the hatreds

---

1. Matt. 5:27, 28a.
2. Matt. 5:33,34a.

of the world will vanish. The best way to accomplish the result is to seek both for the clean heart and the betterment of all humanity at the same time. Hence, the old law of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," must be superseded by the law of love when all men will seek to serve their brethren. If evil comes, the best way to handle it is to return good.

With such teachings, very little if any antagonism was aroused. Those in authority would listen and smile. This was just another dreamer, an idealist, and some day the real world would convince him that practice must consider other things than ideal principles. Such things would do no harm and they would, perhaps, make the people more tolerant. But Jesus did not stop with these matters. He also had some very definite convictions on subjects where the authority of the priests was antagonized. This was the beginning of trouble.

The Sabbath was a very sacred institution to the Jews. As has been shown, the observance of the Sabbath as holy came to them in the Decalogue.[1] But it merely said what they should not do. In the nature of things, life itself required a minimum of exertion even on the Sabbath. So the priestly code in its interpretations of the law laid down restrictions and rules. The Sabbath Day's journey was instituted in all good faith. But it was made a travesty when men learned to evade it through legalistic technicalities. And those who should have denounced such casuistry were silent and condoned the breaking of the law, if only the letter were observed. Jesus did not stop on the Sabbath Day when he felt that good needed to be done.

1. Exodus 20:8-11

He saw a man in need, and that need was the important thing. By all the rules of formal logic the legalist party was entirely right, but a higher moral principle transcended even their logic. He saw that the sick man was the servant and needed help. He remembered "that the manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou, and that thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt.[1]

His disciples ate on the Sabbath, and violated a number of laws in so doing. Jesus replied that "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath."[2] To the legalists this was a direct challenge. This was no fulfillment, but a destruction of all they held dear. If such a man gathered a following about him, and taught such things or set such an example, then the system in power was apt to be destroyed. So the conflict between Jesus and the scribes was on.

They sought to trap him with questions in which any direct answer would involve misunderstanding. They asked about marriage in the kingdom of heaven.[3] The understanding of Jesus was so deep that they listened to a great truth as to the spiritual nature of the Kingdom of Heaven where there is no marriage. They questioned him on divorce[4] but the moral principles of his life were so high that he needed only to re-emphasize what has been mentioned above with regard to adultery. They asked about the commandments. Jesus answered the question, but did not stop there. He laid down the summary of all the

1. Branscomb, The Message of Jesus, p. 38.
2. Mark 2: 23-28
3. Matt. 22:23-33
4. Matt. 19:3-12

commandments dealing both with God and with men. Accused of profaning the Sabbath, he referred them to the actions of David who disregarded the letter of the law and did what he felt was needful on the Sabbath. When the Pharisees condemn him as he casts out demons and intimate that he works by the power of Beelzebub, the prince of demons, he answered that a house divided against itself cannot stand, and continued,

> "And if I by Beelzebub cast out demons, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges."[1]

So did Jesus turn the questionings of those who would persecute him into opportunity to teach truth. It took both knowledge of Jewish literature and tradition, and keen and quick intelligence to accomplish this purpose and to rout the foes who had planned his destruction.

The quick working of his mind is evidenced even more clearly when he turned upon the Pharisees after they had heckled him with questions "to try him," and asked them in turn a question :

> What think ye of the Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in the Spirit call him Lord, saying,
> The Lord said unto my Lord,
> Sit thou on my right hand,
> Till I put thine enemies underneath thy feet?
> If David then called him Lord, how is he his son?[2]

Again, in the temple, when the priests and scribes questioned his

1. Matt. 12:27.
2. Matt. 23:42-45.

authority he turned to ask them,

> The baptism of John, was it from heaven or from men?[1]

knowing that they would not dare to answer since on the one hand they would condemn themselves, and on the other they would rouse the people who felt that John was a prophet.

One additional instance of the conflict between Jesus and the scribes and priests will present fully the critical attitude which he took in dealing with the customs which had grown up. Yet this also shows how he defended his actions by use of his knowledge of Scripture and his deep appreciation of the spirit of God so that no open charge could be made against him.

> And they come to Jerusalem: and he entered into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold and them that bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold the doves; and he would not suffer that any man should carry a vessel through the temple. And he taught, and said unto them, Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations? but ye have made it a den of robbers. And the chief priests and scribes heard it, and sought how they might destroy him; for they feared him, for all the multitude was astonished at his teaching.[2]

In dealing with Jewish law and tradition Jesus used a deep insight. How he gained it makes little difference. That it was unique is best evidenced by its reception. If Hosea's great statement

> I desire goodness and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings.[3]

---

1. Luke 20:4.
2. Mark 11:15-18.
3. Hosea 6:6.

is the basis for this keen insight, that in no way robs Jesus of the characteristic power of discrimination which was his. His judgment was the more scholarly, moreover, because it was balanced. He did not go to extremes, or fly off on a tangent. His whole life was a well rounded whole. He appreciated the ritual of the temple and synagogue. He used its symbolism for what it was worth. He had no polemic against the law as such. He went into the temple himself and worshipped there. He observed the feasts of his people. He sent the healed leper to present himself to the priest and to make the necessary sacrifices according to the law. But at the same time, he did not feel that the washing of hands or feet, the eating of certain foods and abstinence from others, the simple fact of temple attendance or Sabbath observance meant righteousness on the part of the worshiper. He saw these acts as outward forms, back of them lay the heart. Jesus would look into that heart and observe the desires and purposes within. Here was the seat of the moral judgment. When there was conflict, the "ceremonial law must give way before the moral commands."[1]

Jesus made his appeal to reason and not to the authority of tradition. So he felt that a fast was out-of-place while the bridegroom was present.[2] Because of his moral reasoning, he was convinced that it was as easy to say "Thy sins are forgiven thee," as to say "Arise and walk."[3] His reason prompted his rejoinder

1. Branscomb, The Message of Jesus.
2. Luke 5: 33-35
3. Mark 2: 9

that it is the sick and not the well who need a doctor. His appeal to reason could not be refuted when he came into verbal conflict with the scribes and Pharisees. "Jesus did something new - something peculiar to himself."[1] "With unerring clearness he laid hold of the permanent and creative element which was in the Scriptures."[2]

2. Jesus' Attitude Toward the State and His Messianic Consciousness.

There will be no attempt to discuss the Messianic consciousness of Jesus except in its relation to the source material which he may have used and which would have perhaps influenced his thinking, and except as that consciousness influenced his teaching as to the position of man within the state.

"Schweitzer felt that he had found "the long sought key to Jesus' marvellous career. It was to be found in the literature of the Apocalypse. The animating motive of Jesus' preaching in Galilee, and still more of his moral defiance of the power ecclesiastical and secular in Jerusalem, was the conviction that the cataclysm of divine intervention depicted in this literature was at the very point of fulfillment."[3] The Messianic hope was too strong in Judaism to feel that Jesus was not acquainted with it. We must go even farther and say that he was profoundly affected by it. But it need not follow,

1. Wallis, Sociological Study of the Bible, p. 236.
2. Branscomb, The Message of Jesus, p. 38.
3. Bacon, Jesus, Son of God, p. 23f. Johannes Weiss and Nathaniel Schmidt of Cornell also hold to substantially this view.

as Schweitzer feels, that this is the key to his career. The human interests of Jesus were too great to permit any such deduction. Weiss thinks that Jesus knew himself as the Messiah from the first.[1] But there is not sufficient evidence in his early ministry to justify this. It is more rational to look upon the Messianic consciousness as a growing conception which found maturity at the Mount of Transfiguration.

This growing consciousness was affected by the Apocalyptic writings and the oral tradition as well. But it was tempered by the sane thinking of the man. Jesus must have known the picture of the Son of Man which is found in the second chapter of Ezekiel. He knew the references of the Psalmists. He knew what was said in Daniel. There is much question as to whether or not the term Son of Man had attained the meaning of Messiah in Jesus' day. Certainly this meaning was allowable in an apocalyptic sense. Neither is there any unanimity of opinion as to the meaning placed on the expression when Jesus used it.[2] The idea of Klausner and of Sheldon seems very plausible, that Jesus allowed the use of the term and permitted people to read what they would into it. He used it as an intimation of his feeling. This would imply that the term was rather vague and did not have definite meaning at the time. Jesus then gave the expression, in his own mind, the content which he wished.

This growing consciousness in his own mind meant that

1. Weiss, The Life of Jesus, pp. 297ff.
2. Wrede, Welhausen, and Leitzmann regard the expression as a later interpolation. The weight of scholastic opinion, however, is away from this interpretation.

definite convictions were forming with regard to the Messiahship. He was very sure that much of the current thinking was wrong. It was based on a wrong conception of God. Jesus interpreted the Messianic hopes of his people in a new light. He did not intend to lead them in any great military movement for political freedom, following in the steps of the Maccabees. The Christ was not to be like David (Cf. Matt. 22:41-45, Psalm 110). Instead, Jesus, as he came into the conviction that God had chosen him as the Messiah, also became very sure that Israel must find a new conception of the Messiah. Isaiah, one of his most loved books among the Scriptures, came to mind. In Chapter 53 he found the idea he wanted. So as Messiah, he represented himself not as king or one clothed in any material power, but as the servant of Jehovah who would lead the people to a Kingdom, but to the Heavenly Kingdom, the Kingdom of Righteousness.[1]

The Jews were restive under Roman rule. The Pharisees were content to use their power in the temple and in the religious practices. The Sadducees found some measure of satisfaction in their predominance in the Sanhedrin and in their political power, even though it was under Roman supervision. But underneath was a current of feeling that longed and hoped for the day when the Holy City would again be free of the power of the Gentile. Knowing this feeling the Roman soldiers kept close watch over the people.

It was a great compliment to his honesty when the

---

1. This is the idea of the Kingdom within man, a spiritual good. See page 83, below, for further discussion of Jesus' conception of the Kingdom and the possible interpretation of his idea.

Pharisees conspired with the Herodians to ensnare Jesus.

> Teacher, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, and carest not for anyone: for thou regardest not the person of men. Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?[1]

But the basic conception which Jesus had formed of the Messianic Ideal and his attitude toward the Kingdom of God enabled him to rout the conspirators. He would not turn aside from the world as did the Essenes. On the other hand he did not think that this world was all important. He felt that his chief concern was the spiritual aspect of the world. He was willing to leave to Caesar the government of political affairs, if only spiritual matters might be referred to God.

Under different conditions Jesus might have taken a different attitude toward the state. If we interpret his mind aright we feel that he would always consider both principles and actual conditions. His ability to think clearly and to put first things first led him to feel that it was not political government with which he was concerned. Neither was he to follow blindly the Old Messianic ideal of his people, but he developed his own concept of the Messiah, in perfect harmony with the rest of his life and thinking, and continued his work of leading the world of his day by love and righteousness into a Kingdom of God which might be realized within the hearts of men.

---

1. Matt. 22:16,17.

3. Jesus' Interpretation of Religious Values.

It is necessary in analysing the lives of men to seek to separate ideas. It is impossible to deal with one idea alone and entirely separate from others. Each is influenced by the others as the total makes a unified whole. So the consideration of the world and politics was influenced by a Messianic ideal. That consciousness of his Messiahship is inextricably bound up with all the religious ideas of Jesus. In an attempt to see what religious value meant to Jesus in relation to scholarship, three phases of value for religion will be considered. First, what did man mean to Jesus? Secondly, what was his conception of God? And thirdly, what did he think of the relationship between them, or what was his idea of the Kingdom of God?

Beginning again with the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus presents a picture of the value of the life of man in the Beatitudes which causes us to stop and consider what he meant. At first glance it might appear that Jesus is seeking to glorify poverty, meekness, suffering, or hunger. But a consideration of the fact that this type of people were the downtrodden of the earth, that they many times felt they had little or nothing for which to live, makes these statements more clear. Even to those who hunger and thirst, to those who suffer intensely, to those in poverty, life is worth while. God still looks to each individual. And God sees, not what the present condition is so much as the possibilities in the heart. Jesus is por-

traying the deeper, the spiritual, values of life for man. He did not mean that man was blessed because of any lowly estate, but that he might be blessed and give blessing to others in spite of his position.

A further thought is given in chapter six:

> Behold the birds of the heaven, that they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your Heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they? . . . And why are ye anxious concerning raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: Yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if God doth so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe ye, O ye of little faith?[1]

Again Jesus suggested that if God cared for two sparrows which were sold for a farthing, surely he would much more watch over man. It is not a comparison of the value of man with any number of birds or any amount of natural beauty or utility, but rather an emphasis on the supreme value of man for himself, a value which is in no way comparable to anything else on earth. One of the most sacred institutions to the Jews, and one most highly valued by Jesus, was the Sabbath. Yet even the Sabbath was of minor value when compared to man.

This value did not depend on exalted position among men, on riches, or on any external consideration. Perhaps above all the Jew despised the publican - the man who sold himself to Rome for the privilege of "bleeding" taxes from his own countrymen. And to the Jew, the sinner occupied about the same position

1. Matt. 6:26-30.

in the mind of God as the publican did to his fellowmen. Yet Jesus came and associated even with publicans and sinners and justified his actions because of their need. That they were lost to God was the more reason why he should help them. God was only waiting to help any soul who would let him. All were of value in his sight. This spirit could lead only in one direction and that is toward the universal brotherhood of all mankind. So we see Jesus healing the leper of Samaria, the servant of the Gentile Roman centurion, the daughter of the Greek woman who was a Syrophoenician by race.

This high value which Jesus placed on the personality of man, and the advanced position which he took with respect to universal brotherhood were dependent on his idea of God. His idea of God must have been grounded in his own experience. It is inconceivable that a man who has known as father one who was unworthy could transcend the thought of all time to give the noble conception that Jesus gave of the heavenly Father. His idea of Jehovah as Father is the greatest tribute which has ever been paid by any man to the parent to whom he looks as earthly father. The Scriptures which Jesus knew often made use of the terms "Holy One," "Blessed One," "Lord," but Jesus carefully avoided these terms when speaking of God. Jehovah had a closer relationship for him, the Fatherhood of God was essential in his thinking.

This was a big step that Jesus took. To understand it, the place of Jehovah in the Jewish mind must be fully appreciated. Jewish thought had moved from crude anthropomorphism to a transcendant God - but it was not a spiritual conception, witness the Targums of Jonathon and Onkelos (written before 70 A.D.) "The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathon remove from the Old Testament any expressions which imply the personal nearness of God to men. Thus in Gen. 28:3, which says that Jehovah stood above the ladder that Jacob saw in his dream, we read in Onkelos that the glory of Jehovah stood above it; and instead of the face of God in Deut. 32:20 we have his shekinah. In Gen. 18:8, where it is said that the Lord and his two companions ate of the repast furnished by Abraham, Onkelos says, 'it seemed to him as though they ate.' Morever, the Memra, or word of the Lord, appears in the Targums where the Scripture text speaks in an anthropomorphic way concerning God, or uses language that empties his nearness to men."[1] The idea of God carried to the Jew the thought of holiness, which meant an external cleanliness, an outward washing. But to Jesus the idea was more intimate and he made the relationship one of the heart.

There are places in the Old Testament[2] where the idea of Jehovah as a Father is presented. But these are all concerned with his Fatherhood to the Jewish people. Likewise when Jeremiah reached the very height of his insight and made religion a thing of the spirit to be found within the hearts of men, he had no

1. Gilbert, Jesus and His Bible, p. 9.
2. Psalms 68:3; 103:13; Isaiah 40:11, 66:13.

thought save only for the Chosen People. There are passages in the Old Testament which carry a thought of universality but they are scattered and are not emphasized.

Jesus took this thought of the Fatherhood of God and gave to it a new and rich meaning. With him it was all-inclusive. "The one subject on which Jesus claimed to have unique and absolute knowledge was the Heavenly Father."[1] This relationship was more real to him than anything on earth. It was vital. It could not be broken. Because he relied on it and had tested it in all conditions of life, he was sure of what he said when he told men of the Father. It wasn't something barren and abstract, but was a living relationship which could be experienced every day. The difference it made can best be shown in the prayer life of Jesus as compared with the Pharisee whom he pictures in his parable as standing in the temple and praying, "I thank thee, Lord, that I am not as other men. . ."[2] And the kind of Father whom Jesus presented is pictured in the parable of the Prodigal.[3] If Jesus had given nothing more than this conception he had earned the eternal gratitude of men. It was stupendous. It is so great an idea that the world still marvels at it.

It has been shown that Jesus developed a Messianic consciousness. The thought of the Kingdom of God which this pre-supposes embraced not only himself, as Messiah, and God as

1. Ibid., p. 1.
2. Luke 18:11
3. Luke 15:11-32

Father, but also all mankind as subjects, or sons, of the same God and Father. It was in the Kingdom that Jesus linked his conceptions of the Fatherhood of God to the supreme value of man.

Jesus had so much to say about the Kingdom that it is difficult to summarize his ideas in order to compare them with the prevailing thought of the time. There are at least five meanings which can be found for the Kingdom as presented.

1. It is conceived as a divine rule. This is the fulfillment of the Old Testament conception. It is the idea of a theocracy on earth. See Matt. 5:17; 6:10, 33.

2. It is the company of those under the divine rule, not the rule itself but the ruled. This is illustrated by the Parable of the Tares, Matt. 13:24-36, and the Parable of the Drag Net, Matt. 13:47-50. This idea will account for mention of the small or great in the Kingdom, Matt. 5:19; 11:11.

3. It is the blessing which comes to those under the divine rule. Compare the Beatitudes and the Parable of the Vineyard, Matt. 21:43.

4. It is the future place of those under the divine rule. It is a kingdom beyond death. See Matt. 6:21; 8:11; 26:29; Luke 13:29; 22:29,30; Mark 14:25.

5. It is a spiritual good. As such it is resident within man. It is not physical and cometh not with observation. See Matt. 19:23; 21:31; Luke 17:20. This idea seems to fit in best with the entire teaching of Jesus. If this is the essential

meaning which he intended to leave, it makes plain his aversion to the seeming necessity for so much physical healing. Not that Jesus did not want people to have healthy bodies or to enjoy life, but at times the very press of those seeking a cure for physical ailments demanded so much of his time and energy that the primary concerns of his life suffered. It was this idea of the kingdom which was presented as a little child, that within man which was pure and good and holy and which could grow. This was the idea of the Kingdom as the supreme good for which all else should be sacrificed if necessary. Such was the kingdom likened to a pearl of great price.

With these ideas of Jesus, a comparison of the thought of the kingdom of God as held by the Jewisn nation can be made. With the scribes as well as with Jesus, it meant the Messianic hope. But to the scribe it was to be realized without, with Jesus the realization would come within. To the Pharisee, the Kingdom was obedience to law, ceremonial cleanliness; to Jesus, it was repentance or submission to the good will of God, moral uprightness. In the Kingdom, the scribes found forgiveness of sins by observance of the ritual of the law; Jesus found full and free forgiveness, even to seventy times seven.[1] With the Jews it was acts; with Jesus it was motive. To the Pharisee, the relationship between himself and God found expression in prayer which was elaborate and seen of men; to Jesus, it was found in communion with God in solitude. To the Jew, the brotherhood of

1. This was, of course, conditioned upon repentance.

the Kingdom was physical, embracing the sons of Abraham; to Jesus, it was spiritual, embracing the needy, neighbors in affliction, or sorrow or suffering.

In religious values Jesus went so far beyond the conceptions of the Jews of his time, that it is not surprising that they could not follow him, and even condemned him. We are all Hedonists to a greater or less degree. The Jew was no exception. He sought for happiness. But Jesus learned that Hedonism is just the beginning. Jesus had never heard of the paradox of Hedonism, but he understood that when "happiness is made the end of human action,... it must not be directly aimed at, or in other words that 'to get happiness one must forget it.'"[1] The fundamental difference between Jesus and the thought of his age is expressed in his observation:

> Whosoever shall seek to gain his life shall lose it: but whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it.[2]

Jesus had very definite messages to give to the people and they required an appreciation of religious value before they could be understood. It required scholarship to formulate and hold steadily to these principles in the face of so much opposition. But Jesus was not only sure in his heart, he was also convinced in his mind that he had found the truth. So he was willing to submit his own life to the test which has been indicated. In presenting his enlarged conception of the value of man, of the Fatherhood of God, and the universality and moral and spiritual

1. Everett, Moral Values, p. 142.
2. Luke 17:33.

nature of the Kingdom, he lost his life, but in the losing he gained it. The gain was love enthroned.

4. The World Vision of Jesus.

The world of Jesus' day was much smaller than it is in the twentieth century. Nevertheless, it required as much of vision to catch a world outlook as is required today. A man may know a great deal about certain subjects, but unless he can relate his knowledge to all reality he is no scholar. Preeminently among his contemporaries Jesus was the scholar in this respect.

He had every reason for a narrow, prejudiced viewpoint. There was a great deal of hatred evidenced on all sides. The burdens of taxations to a foreign power were heavy. The shame of submission by a proud people to those who worshipped heathen gods is easy to understand. Yet Jesus transcended this. His vision included not only the entire world of his day, but all ages. It was all God's world.

He saw the world advancing. It was not static. In this respect he was plain in his condemnation of the narrowness of his people. A good scholar, he accepted new views as they came to him and asked only that they should be justified in their relationship to the totality of his experience in his own thinking and moral judgments.[1]

A keen insight can find in the third temptation something of the meaning of this world vision to Jesus. Jesus

1. It is the spirit of the whole life of the man as portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels, rather than a few particular instances, which leads to this view. The apocalyptic passages have not been considered because the writer feels that Jesus was not vitally concerned with the subject, and that much of the material we have is interpretative of his thought rather than actual.

saw "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them." But that which man terms glory he saw also as only a bauble. He recognized how easy it might be to secure the praise and worship of men. He knew that the whole world would seek for a time any one who might interest them in something novel. But he was fully aware, also, that this worship was transitory. A Kingdom big enough for the world must be built on a solid foundation. He rejected the cheap and chose the difficult task. No one but a man of great insight and of high and firm moral purpose could have undertaken and carried through the task.

B. Jesus as a Sympathetic Scholar - Evaluation

Scholarship can only be attributed when the scholar is able to let others know of his learning and ability. The man who had complete knowledge, save only the means of communicating that knowledge to others, would have no claim to scholarship. That is an attribute which must come from without. Many men know a great deal but are limited because they are unable to impart their knowledge to others. Scholarship is of much greater value to him who has the faculty of using it for the benefit of his fellows. One of the great requisites for this is an appreciative mind, the ability to evaluate honestly and fairly the objective world. To heighten the worth of Jesus as a scholar, he possessed this faculty to an unusual degree.

1. As shown in his appreciation of nature.

When the world (of men) was too much with him, Jesus

went apart into the mountains to pray. There is something that inspires one in the majesty of a great mountain. It has the power to lift the soul up. But at the same time, it makes such a comparison between the greatness of the world and the smallness of man that the thought is humbling. When Jesus went into the mountains, he found all these things, communion with God in solitude, increased power, and humility.[1]

Man always comes back from such a retreat with a renewed power of appreciation for the little things of life. Because all things in life were the handiwork of the Father, Jesus had a keener appreciation of them. He saw the sheep on the hills and understood how like to them were the people who wandered in the world not knowing where they were going or why. This fine appreciation made it possible for him to use nature to illustrate his thoughts.[2] He walked by the Sea of Galilee and watched the fisher-boats come in. Their success or failure with a day's catch might mean much. It was no lovely place, the fish-dock, with its smell. But Jesus knew that he must seek beyond the fish to find the relationship which they represented between the physical needs of men and the world in which they lived. Or he looked out on the red lilies over the hills of Galilee and found in them a beauty which could come only as the handiwork of the Father who created all things.[3]

Only one who appreciates nature, and who evaluates its power and strength, its beauty and tenderness, can find the

1. Luke 4:14; 9:37,ff.; 22:39,ff.
2. Luke 8:4-8; 15:3-7; 21:29,30.
3. Matt.6:28. Jesus was not enough of a philosopher to question the ugly and sordid aspects of nature. No claim has been made for him in this respect.

full value which lies in the world. Jesus saw in the secret of the growing seed an opportunity to make a lesson clear. In the mystery of the multiplication of life, thirty-, sixty-, or a hundred-fold, he plumbed the depths of philosophic thinking but in such a way that he who had ears could hear and understand.

All this is evidence of a mind which is open, and which finds the true values of life. Jesus showed the same discernment here that he used in other fields. No effort is made to claim for him any such knowledge of plants or animal life as men have today. A child of the twentieth century knows much more about the structure of a plant or the functional processes of animal life than Jesus knew. But he must be judged in the light of the knowledge of his own day. He showed a love for the fields and the open air. He knew the habits of the sheep and the ways of the sower of grain. What we can estimate of this kind of knowledge would not be sufficient to call Jesus a scholar, but what he showed of appreciation and the sense of value goes to confirm the mind of a scholar which is made more evident elsewhere.

2. <u>As shown by his Dealings with People</u>.

In the understanding of human nature, Jesus has not been surpassed. From the beginning to the end of his ministry incidents multiply which indicate how well he understood, how deeply he sympathized, how keenly he evaluated life as he met it.

He did not know the terms, but he was psychologist, pedagogue, sociologist, and philosopher. He was far ahead of his time in these fields.

A comparison might be made between the teaching of Jesus and that of Socrates. Both were masters. Socrates taught well, but he taught only those who came seeking instruction. Jesus taught equally well, and if we consider the type of student or listener, we must acknowledge that he had the harder task. Perhaps it was children who came running for a story. He was not too busy for them.[1] It might be a rich man who was earnestly seeking to set his mind at peace when he found no satisfaction in obedience to the law. There were crowds, mingled people of all degrees of intelligence. And again the twelve gathered about him that he might explain to them the meaning of words which were obscure. For them all, Jesus had the word which helped.

This may be attributed to the fact that Jesus was sure in his convictions. Thus he was enabled to speak with authority. He knew. And it was partly due to the fact that he knew how to teach. But there was also the element of his understanding of people. The psychological "instinct" aided him. He had been tempted himself, and had not forgotten how sore was the temptation. He could understand when men were conquered. He knew grief and could appreciate the grief of others. The joys and sorrows, the heart aches and the laughter, were common experiences. In one

1. See Matt. 19:14. An attempt is made to catch the spirit of Jesus rather than to hold to the literal translation.

thing he excelled. He had found a peace of mind and he wanted to share it with any who would permit. Because he was pure in heart, he could see the hearts of men and understand them.

Knowing men, Jesus also understood society. A true scholar is not blinded to the evils and sins of his own people or generation. Jesus realized the narrowness of his nation and grieved for it. He appreciated the meaning of the mob. He had not forgotten that it was mob spirit which had killed certain of the prophets. In his own experience he learned very quickly that the crowd can be swayed by anything which is spectacular, but he could not hope to have them stop and reason with him.

So in preparation for the future, he was forced to neglect the little pleasures which might be his in helping one or two or a small group. He must lay a background of principle. He must be sure that his followers understood him and his mission. The philosopher took the only course which was open to him and taught the small group of twelve who were more appreciative and who sought to do the will of him through love even when they could not always understand.

While Jesus showed a fine sense of discernment in his evaluation of nature, he has not been surpassed in his ability to evaluate human life. It has been pointed out that he held human personality as the most sacred thing in the world. Appreciation requires sympathy. Jesus possessed this, and it was never withheld in his dealings with men. It was hard for

for him to understand how nine of ten lepers could forget or care so little that no word of thanks came after their cure. He grieved that the rich young ruler could not see the higher value in the spiritual life. He sensed the guilt of society when the woman found in adultery was brought to him, and felt that it was not just to condemn her and permit the social system which fostered such crime to go unchallenged. He was so sympathetic with the needs and illnesses of those about him that he forgot himself in helping others until he was forced to go apart where the troubles of the world would not press on him continually.

Not only did Jesus have a great fund of knowledge, and so qualify as a technical scholar, but he had the rarer quality--he was able to interpret and evaluate the knowledge which was his. He knew his subject, and then he knew how to use it.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

Any treatment of any phase of the life of Jesus must come finally to the Synoptic Gospels for its source material. The Gospel of John adds a different story of his life. It is written to present the philosophy of his life rather than the simple picture of the Great Teacher. Numerous apocryphal works are unreliable and offer very little of value.

Jesus was trained much like any normal boy. He had the distinct advantage of a good home. He learned first in this home, then he was taught in the schools of the time. He was deeply impressed by the synagogue and all the religious practices of the people. In his nature he was a religious genius, and all his associations and environment spoke to him of God.

He learned to read the Scriptures of the Jews. Certainly he must have known them in the Hebrew. He understood Aramaic, also, although he possibly was not able to read it. There are some indications that he may have had a speaking knowledge of Greek, but no definite statement can be made. Being the religious genius that he was, he absorbed the sacred literature. He knew the Jewish Law and Prophets, and at least the Psalms in addition. Very probably he also knew of the remainder of the books which were later canonized into the Old Testament. If he had not read much of the Old Testament Apocryphal and Apocalyptic

literature, he had heard it discussed and knew the content and thought of it. And finally he had at least the average knowledge of the unwritten Priestly code.

From this material which was his, he quoted a great deal in the things he taught. Some of this was by direct quotation, but he also referred often times to incidents in the Scriptures. His references are so numerous and varied that they leave no doubt as to his knowledge.

In a narrow sense this would entitle him to be called a scholar but he had even wider claims. He was critical in the things he quoted. He criticized the legal system under which Israel was stagnating. He had no use for custom just because it was custom. It must be of value. He had a keen sense of wit and was able to match his mind with the scribes and priests of the time. He found a new and high value in the personality of man. He gave to the world a loftier and truer conception of God than it had known. He presented the relationship between God and man as that of father and son. This was to be realized in the Kingdom of God. Jesus, himself, had a unique mission in bringing that Kingdom to the world through the hearts of men. And in the Kingdom, the whole world was to be linked together as children of one Father God, a universal brotherhood.

Moreover, Jesus was a man of the people. He lived among them and understood their problems. He enjoyed the common life which they lived. He gave it a new dignity by showing

its worth. He appreciated the world about him, which was his Father's work. He saw good in all men, and because of his sympathy and understanding he was able to reach the lowliest.

Without doubt, Jesus was far in advance of his time. He has given to the world truth which is everlasting, and an ethical and religious standard which has not been equalled in nineteen hundred years.

The evidence for the scholarship of Jesus has been presented. There is no reason to modify the thesis. Jesus certainly was a scholar.

He could not be classed as a historian, although he had thorough knowledge of the history of his own people. No more was expected of a man of his day. He was not a scientist in any sense of the word. But he had a deep appreciation of the materials with which science deals. It would be hundreds of years before any of the modern scientific formulations would be given to the world. He was no astronomer. He looked to the sun and moon as vast bodies moving across the dome of the heavens. His knowledge of the stars was from the psalmist who sang of their beauty and stood awed in their presence. He did not know mathematics. If there was any used in the carpenter shop, it made no difference in his later life. His ethics was not well formulated. He did not know the technical study, but when it came to living, his

actions were all in agreement with a strict code of ethics which he carried written in his heart. He was no logician, yet when the learned men of the time sought to trap him in words or by argument, he put their much learning to shame with his simple answers.

In the broader sense, Jesus was a psychologist, a pedagogue, a sociologist, and a philosopher. He used the tools of the thinkers in these branches today, and in so doing was far ahead of his time. For the source of his deep convictions in these fields, he went to life. He learned from his own experience. He was taught in the family circle, and in a wide acquaintance of friends. He was an apt pupil in the out-of-doors. But beyond all, he found deep within his own soul a knowledge of God which was the deepest conviction of his life. Everything else fostered this thought and was related to it. This was the supreme value to him.

Scholarship may also include teaching, giving out what one knows. Jesus did this in an unusual manner. He was simple and yet profound. He used the common things of life, yet spoke the profound truths of the ages through them. He summarized the Law and the Prophets in the Golden Rule,

> All things, therefore, whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also unto them; for this is the Law and the Prophets.[1]

Again, he brought the law down into the one great commandment, which, with that like unto it, serves for the perfect law of love.

1. Matt. 7:12.

These teachings of Jesus were natural, not formal. They were popular, not logical or systematic. They were picturesque, not literal. And they were clear, not hidden.[1] Only a true scholar can effect this.

Beside knowing life, Jesus was also acquainted with the Jewish literature of his day. As he had discriminated in dealings with men, so he also was discriminating in his handling of the Scriptures. The quotations and references which are found in his sayings must point to a much wider knowledge than they represent in themselves, for no man quotes all he knows.

He had a lofty estimate of the value of the Old Testament. It was the record of the dealings of God with his people. And because he held these sacred writings so high, he made a clear discrimination between the ceremonialism and the moral teachings which he found there. The former were always to be subordinated. They were simply the form. It could change from day to day, but the moral law he saw was the law of God.

He made use of his knowledge in his own life - the temptation experience, his prayer life. He also used it as he taught his followers - the Beatitudes, his comparison of the old law with his interpretation. It influenced him as he came into the conception of his high mission. If he was to be the Son of Man, the Messiah, then these terms must have the best meaning which he could find for them in the full knowledge which

1. Branscomb, The Message of Jesus, pp. 23ff.

he had of God, the Father of all mankind.

Jesus was a scholar, who taught by rousing interest and not by satisfying it, whose life showed itself to be full and rich and backed by a great reserve, who had a synoptic outlook, saw the full implications, drew his own conclusions, and through them gave to the world a new interpretation of the meaning and worth of life.

No school today would need be ashamed to list Jesus of Nazareth among those whom it has honored with degrees. He was a scholar pre-eminent. He knew his subject. Jesus, without the gown, was still a Doctor of the Kingdom of God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bacon, Benjamin Wisner, Jesus, the Son of God

New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1930 (Entire book)

Barton, George A., Archaeology and the Bible

Philadelphia, American Sunday School Union, 1916 (Chapter XXV, only)

Berguer, Georges, Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus

New York, Harcourt Brace & Co., 1923 (Chapters 1 and 2)

Branscomb, Harvie, The Message of Jesus

Nashville, Cokesbury Press, 1930 (Entire Book)

Burkitt, F. Crawford, The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus

Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1910 (Entire book)

Case, Shirley Jackson, Jesus, A New Biography

Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1927 (Through Chapter 4)

Edersheim, Alfred, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (2 Vols.)

New York, Longmans Green & Co., 1910 (Entire work)

Edersheim, Alfred, Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Time of Christ

London, Religious Tract Society, (no date) (Entire book)

Friedlander, Gerald, The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount

New York, The Block Publishing Co., 1911 (Entire book)

Gilbert, George Holley, Jesus and His Bible

New York, The Macmillan Co., 1926 (Chapters 1-5)

Gilbert George Holley, The Revelation of Jesus

New York, The Macmillan Co., 1899 (Entire book)

Horne, Herman Harrell, Jesus the Master Teacher

New York, The Association Press, 1920 (Entire book)

Josephus, Flavius, Antiquities of the Jews

Philadelphia, J.B.Smith & Co., (No date) (Book 18)

Klausner, Joseph, Jesus of Nazareth

New York, The Macmillan Co., 1929 (Entire book)

Montefiore, C. G., The Synoptic Gospels (2 Vols.)

London, The Macmillan Co., 1927 (Entire work)

Peters, John P., Bible and Spade

The Bross Library, Vol. X 1921 (Chapter 6)

Pick, Bernard, The Extra-Canonical Life of Christ

New York, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1903, (Entire)

Porter, Frank Chamberlain, The Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers

New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918, (Introduction only)

Smith, David, The Days of His Flesh

New York, Geo. H. Doran & Co., (No date) (Entire)

Toy, Crawford Howell, Quotations in the New Testament

New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884, (Entire)

Walker, Thomas, Jewish Views of Jesus

New York, The Macmillan Co., 1931 (Entire)

Walker, Thomas, What Jesus Read

New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925 (Entire)

Wallis, Louis, Sociological Study of the Bible

Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1912 (Chapter 25 only)

Warschaur, J., The Historical Life of Jesus

New York, The Macmillan Co., 1927 (Entire)

Weiss, Bernard, The Life of Jesus (Three Vols.)
Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1890 (Entire)

Wendt, Hans Hinrich, The Teachings of Jesus (Two Vols.)
Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1901 (Entire)

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02575 1761